Marie R

B M3699w

Waterson

Mary II, queen of England

403396

May 14'36 F 6115 3

BOOK NO. B M3699w

ACCESSION 403396

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

VITA SINE LITERIS MORS EST

250 1/2

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

3 1223 00529 1985

DUKE · UNIVERSITY · PUBLICATIONS

MARY II
QUEEN OF ENGLAND
1689-1694

LONDON:
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

NEW YORK:
G. E. STECHERT & CO.

TOKYO:
MARUZEN AND COMPANY, LTD.

SHANGHAI:
EDWARD EVANS & SONS, LTD.

BUENOS AIRES:
J. LAJOUANE & CO.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/maryiiqueenofeng0000nell_j8o1

Marie R

MARY II

QUEEN OF ENGLAND

1689-1694

BY

NELLIE M. WATERSON

B. Litt. (Oxon.), M.A. (B'ham)

S. T. PAUL LIBRARY

DURHAM · NORTH CAROLINA

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

MCMXXVIII

COPYRIGHT 1928
BY DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

B
M3699w
403396

YANKEE PUBLIC LIBRARY

THE SEEMAN PRESS
DURHAM, N. C.
Printed in the United States of America

3 1223 00529 1985

To

My first teacher

1912-1914

NOTE

My thanks are due to Mr. Godfrey Davies, the supervisor of my studies in Oxford; to Mr. A. E. Stamp, for giving me access to the Finch manuscripts placed in the Public Record Office, London, for the use of the Historical Manuscripts Commission; to the Curators of the Schools, Oxford, for lalowing Kneller's picture of Queen Mary II to be photographed; to Professor William Roy Smith, Bryn Mawr College, Pennslvyania, and Professor Paull F. Baum, Duke University, North Carolina, for kindly suggestions; and to Duke University Press for the publication of the book.

NELLIE M. WATERSON

Washington, D. C.

CONTENTS

Frontispiece

I. *Introduction* 3

II. *The First Year as Queen* 33

III. *The Summer of 1690* 50

IV. *The Victory of La Hogue and its Results* 79

V. *Politics* 119

VI. *Ecclesiastical Affairs* 140

VII. *The Queen's Influence on Society* 159

VIII. *Personal Relationship's* 183

IX. *Conclusion* 196

Appendices 205

Bibliography 211

Index 215

MARY II

QUEEN OF ENGLAND

1689-1694

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

MARY II of England left no record of the memories of her childhood. She was born in April, 1662, and it is therefore safe to assume that her mind received impressions from such events as the Plague of London, which caused the removal of the Duke of York's household from Twickenham to York, and the death of her mother in 1671, which was followed two years later by the coming of Mary of Modena as the wife of her father. In childhood she was busily occupied with the lessons and pastimes which she shared with her sister Anne and the daughters of her governess, Lady Francis Villiers. For her religious instruction, she was under the direction of Compton, Bishop of London; and Dr. Edward Lake was chaplain to the two royal sisters. A sentimental friendship marked the advent of adolescence: the letters are extant in which Mary professed an undying affection for the daughter of Sir Allen Apsley, who apparently at one time had shared her lessons.

She had the conventional education of the seventeenth century girl of high birth: she was given some knowledge of modern languages and a little history; she acquired 'accomplishments' such as dancing and painting; her religious education was thoroughly Protestant, a concession which Charles II deemed it wise to make to the prejudices of the English people.

The thirty-two years of Mary's life were momentous years in the history of European politics. Maritime and commercial rivalry had long existed between the English and the Dutch, and war proved inevitable. At its conclusion in 1667, England, Sweden, and the Dutch Republic bound themselves in the

Triple Alliance to make joint resistance to French aggression, and this compelled France to agree to a general peace, but Louis aimed at soon freeing Charles from his new entanglements.

Charles II had been in touch with Rome as early as 1662 on the subject of the conversion of England to the Roman obedience. At a secret conference held in January, 1669, the decision was made to announce to Louis XIV the projected conversion of England and of the two royal brothers, Charles and James. In May, 1670, the First Secret Treaty of Dover was signed, by which was planned the return of England to Rome, the joint attack of England and France upon Holland, and Charles' support of the Bourbon claims to the throne of Spain. In October, 1670, William, then a young man barely twenty years of age, made a visit to England which lasted until February, 1671. There is no evidence that he then made the acquaintance of his future wife.

By April, 1672, England and France were at war with the United Provinces, and in England the Second Declaration of Indulgence had just been proclaimed. Within three months William, who had been made Captain General in the preceding February, was forced to retire. The brothers De Witt tried to make peace, but the terms proffered by Louis and Charles were impossible. William's courage at this crisis excited general enthusiasm, which caused him to be elected Stadtholder in July. He saw clearly the need of seeking the friendship of England in an alliance against France, but he was not prepared to sacrifice the integrity of the national territory for personal advantage, as was suggested to him by English envoys. Great concessions were offered to England, but the demand of Charles was still too high. In August came the murder of the brothers

De Witt. It was not until February, 1674, that peace between England and the United Provinces was proclaimed. What caused Charles to make this separate peace, which his treaty with Louis had expressly forbidden?

Both the war and the Declaration of Indulgence were very unpopular in England. That their real motives were perfectly understood was at once evident when Parliament reassembled in February, 1673. The intensity of the dread with which the nation regarded popery was fully revealed to Charles and his government. They were forced to cancel the Declaration, and the Test Act was passed, causing the resignation of the Duke of York and of Clifford from all offices. In the autumn session, the French alliance was warmly denounced, and the determination of the Houses forced Charles to conclude peace.

Early in 1674, Sir William Temple proposed to William at the Hague a marriage alliance with the Princess Mary. William replied that 'his fortunes were not in a condition for him to think of a wife.' Upon the receipt of Temple's report as to the unsatisfactory result of his mission, Arlington and Lord Ossory were ordered to the Hague. If William asked upon what terms a general peace might be made, Lord Ossory was to reply that if the Prince of Orange did what was expected of him, 'he might then pretend to marry the Princess Mary,' and his addresses would be well received. On May 20th, a correspondent, Sir Walter Vane, wrote to Danby in reference to the marriage: 'I do not find any averseness but rather inclinations towards itt . . . itt lookes as if itt weare nowe att a stand. Yett I am told the Prince designes sometime this winter to make a journey into England. Hee says himselfe till this warre bee ended, hee will not thinke of marriage, yett I must tell your Lordship I

doe find it generally both desired and liked . . . As to publique affairs, the Prince Consort cannot be persuaded but that the French interest has so great a prevalence at Whittehall, that notwithstanding the neutrality his Majesty pretends, he will allways be mastered by itt, and therefore is feareful the King is not so kinde to him as hee wishes and might hope being his nephew . . . They desire nothing so much as the continuance of his Majesty's friendship and alliance.'[1]

William's refusal to enter into marriage negotiations at this time cannot be regarded as a personal affront to the Princess Mary, who was then but a child twelve years old. He was probably influenced by three considerations: he was suspicious of French intrigue and could not place faith in the sincerity of his uncle; he regarded it as a breach of honour to desert his Spanish allies, even to make a politically advantageous marriage; and he did not know anything of the personality of his cousin, —'I am told the Prince designes sometime this winter to make a journey into England.' Mary doubtless remained in ignorance of these negotiations.

Early in 1677 the five years' contest between France and the United Provinces came to a crisis. Louis' repeated successes in Flanders and Sicily gave birth to the fear in England that Charles would throw in his weight with him, and an address was made from the Commons recommending a breach with France. In May a definite alliance with the Dutch was demanded, but Charles adjourned Parliament. At the end of May a vote had been carried in the Commons for 'naming Holland to bee an Allie . . . [which] much displeased the Court.'[2]

[1] Morrison MSS, App. to 9th Rep. Hist. MSS Comm., p. 449.
[2] Foxcroft's Life of Halifax, I. 129.

William in the meantime was forming relations with English statesmen, and this small group became the nucleus of an ever-growing opposition to the policy of Charles II. The latter was also gradually realizing that the temper in the Commons was such that it would be to his advantage to establish closer relationships with his nephew. William himself had made a definite step by summoning Temple to discuss with him the question of marriage. He asked Temple's opinion upon two points: Would a marriage alliance with the Princess Mary make it appear to his influential friends in England who formed the Opposition that he was in the interest of the Court? What were the humour and disposition of the young lady, 'for no circumstances of fortune or interest could engage him without those of the person?' Temple was able to reassure William on these matters, and the Prince then declared his intention of beginning his suit. In June William wrote to Danby a letter of credence for Bentinck, who was to precede his master. In the instructions which William gave to Bentinck, no mention is made of the proposed marriage alliance. Bentinck was to ascertain if Charles was willing to act as a mediator, and to exert his influence to obtain terms of peace favourable to the United Provinces and their Allies, and to find out if Charles was willing definitely to enter into an alliance with the Confederates.[3] On June 22nd William wrote commanding Bentinck's immediate return, and on the 25th, in a letter to Danby, after thanking him for the frankness with which he had spoken to Bentinck, he concluded: 'J'espère que . . . vous vouderes faire souvenir Sa Maj. de la promesse qu'il a fait à M. Bentinck, de m'envoyer quelqu'un de confiance, pour m'informer de ses sentiments après quoy j'atten-

[3] Bentinck and William III, by E. Grew, pp. 36 f.

deres avec un impatience extrême.'[4] Evidently at this time Charles refused to commit himself. In August he renewed his secret engagements with France by undertaking in consideration of a pension of £200,000 to prorogue Parliament till April, 1678, but in September he invited William to visit England, and in October William arrived. His Allies suspected him of treason, but the Republic imperatively needed peace, and it was his intention to make one that should prove as little injurious as possible, and to marry the Princess Mary, since he no longer hoped for the entry of the King of England into the war. William, after having dexterously avoided discussion of diplomatic business with the two brothers, King Charles and James, the Duke of York, at length, as Temple recorded in his memoirs, 'prevailed upon the flexibility of the King to let the marriage be first signed and concluded, for upon the sight of the Princess Mary, he was pleased with her person and all those signs of such a humour as had been described to him.'[5] The marriage was officially announced on October 24. Charles, by consenting to it, had practically though not openly broken with France. His confronting Parliament in January, 1677-8, marks the breach with Louis, but events during the first half of the year prove that Charles' mind was not yet made up. It was not until the end of July that the six years' war was brought to a conclusion by the Treaty of Nimeguen.

One writer has referred to William and Mary as a second Petruchio and Katharine; another speaks of Mary's oriental ideas concerning the conduct of a dutiful wife; their statements are exaggerations. Contemporaries certainly noted William's apparent neglect of his wife during the short time they remained

[4] Morrison MSS, App. to 9th Rep. Hist. MSS Comm., p. 451.
[5] Temple's Memoirs, II. 240.

in England after their marriage. If in thought they be divested of their regal status and regarded as an average young man and woman, it is at once obvious that their situation was a singular one, even in the seventeenth century. She was a child of fifteen; he was twelve years her senior, and they were brought into the most intimate of human relationships with hardly any previous knowledge of each other. Mary shed many tears, and William kept away from her. He was no courtier, and it was probably his very sincerity that made it impossible for him to act in such a way as would have satisfied critical English eyes.

Mary up to the time of her marriage had the gaiety and high spirits of a care-free child. This exuberance at times expressed itself in a form which to modern taste seems vulgar, but it is hard to believe that she fell beneath contemporary standards of good breeding. There are expressions in letters to Miss Apsley written at the age of ten or eleven years, which make it certain that Mary had also that precocity of the seventeenth-century girl which fitted her for an early marriage,—a knowledge that lacked the illumination given by a spiritual maturity.

Many of Mary's difficulties with her husband were caused by her being always the centre of conflict in the Dutch court. Although there was an agreement that she was to remain an Anglican, dissensions soon occurred on religious matters. She at first attended the services of a body of Dutch religionists of the Congregational type, and read books of dissenting theology, presumably at the suggestion of William. Her Anglican divines disapproved, and then William found the child of sixteen gravely poring over Eusebius and Hooker. Having no convenience for private Anglican worship, she caused her dining room to be converted into a chapel, and then invited William to inspect it,

which he did somewhat ungraciously. He was often discourteous to his wife's chaplains: he was probably conscious of the antagonism and suspicion with which they regarded him.

Mary had many problems to solve and not the least was that of William's mysterious personality. He was doubtless the object of most intense study. In March, 1678, William left hurriedly to join the army, and the parting between the husband and wife was a tender one. Mary wrote to her friend, Miss Apsley, speaking of her love for her husband and of her anxiety at his going into danger. She adds: 'I hope it wont be long now before I shall go to Breda where I shall se the Prince, for that is so neer the army he can live in the town and go to it at any time at a quarter of an hour warning.'[6] William had succeeded, in spite of his taciturnity, his occasional rudeness, and his lack of physical attractions, in winning the love of his wife, a fact that is a tribute to her intelligence. She had realised his heroic quality. She ordered her own life, however, as it pleased her best; she retained and supported Anglican divines in her calvinistic court; and she read her books of Anglican theology. So far there is no indication of a Petruchian policy.

The chief contest that dominated Mary's early life in Holland was that waged for her loyalty and affection by her husband and her father. The hostility between them, and her duty in relation to that hostility, must have caused deep thought. It was founded on something more than mere personal dislike: issues which would ultimately be of importance in the development of European politics were at stake, although Mary was not then sufficiently developed to perceive this. She had yet to learn how to place personal relationships in their right per-

[6] Letters of Mary II, in *Quarterly Review*, vol. 214, pp. 82 f.

spective; her mind had to pass from that stage where the concrete and particular are stressed to the one in which problems are solved by a consideration of abstract and general principles. The process of changing the gay, sentimental, rather crude young girl into the woman who was able successfully to grapple with difficult political situations, and thus to arouse the deep admiration of statesmen with whom she had daily to confer, began during this time of conflict in Holland.

What did Mary know of the Titus Oates revelations and the Exclusion contest that raged in England from the end of 1678 till the middle of 1681? How did the latter present itself to her mind? As a result of the elections at the beginning of 1679, the country party was in a much increased majority, and it was known that they would immediately bring up for discussion the exclusion of the Duke of York from his heritage, so he was ostentatiously sent off to Brussels. On the 28th March, Mary wrote to Miss Apsley: 'I will nott speke of the sad coming of the Duke and Duches who are by this time I hope well att Brussels.'[7] Obviously her attitude was one of sympathy for her father. In May the Exclusion Bill was read for the first time, and then Charles, to save his brother, dissolved Parliament. That Mary parted from her father in an agony of grief when he left for England at the beginning of October, 1679, is significant. She felt a deep pity for his political troubles and perhaps a little perplexity as to William's ideas concerning them.

In the previous July, Henry Sidney had arrived at the Hague with the object of persuading William to ingratiate himself with people and Parliament in England. There is no evidence

[7] Letters of Two Queens, Bathurst, p. 97.

that William ever discussed the Exclusion Bill with his wife, but that it was never referred to between them, when James and Monmouth were both seeking refuge at the Hague, is unlikely. William's attitude to the Bill from the first was ambiguous.

In the spring of 1680 rumours were afloat that the Prince was treating his wife unkindly; Dr. Ken and Sir Gabriel Sylvius more than once referred to his harshness and apparent cruelty. At the end of March Mary was seriously ill, but her sickness was not of long duration. It was something more than William's habitually cold manner that caused his wife's illness, if it was not due merely to physical causes. She may have been sorely distressed by the intuition of what was at best a half-hearted loyalty that William was giving to her family.

It would appear that William's interests coincided with the Exclusionists', and Sidney and the Sunderlands tried to persuade him that he would gain by Exclusion. In September, 1680, he at last declared himself. In a conversation with Sidney, which the latter recorded in his diary, he said that he saw plainly that he was very likely to be deprived of his right in England, and at the same time to be undone in Holland, 'but if the stake that he hath in this world were ten times greater, it should all go, rather than that he should save it by doing an ill thing. He thinks excluding the Duke an injustice, and he would not advise the King to do it for all the world; he believes that he shall be the first that will be undone, but he hopes God will give him patience, and have a care of him in all conditions.'[8] On the 11th November, in Sidney's diary is the note: 'The Prince and Princess supt with me. We received the Bill against

[8] Sidney's Diary, Blencowe, II. 120.

the Duke.'[9] In the letter to Sidney which accompanied it, Sir L. Jenkins, referring to the Bill, said: 'It does not provide or mention who shall succeed the King.' In November, 1680, owing to the passionate eloquence of Halifax, the Bill was defeated, and immediately began the consideration of expedients, one of which was that James should succeed, but with a limitation of prerogative. To this William was averse, for a restriction of monarchical authority might mean an approximation of government to republicanism. At the beginning of December the Dutch ambassador interviewed Charles to remonstrate about limitations, and in the same month William sent James an assurance of his good faith. The influences that finally caused William to decide against Exclusion were three. There was powerful pro-Gallican sentiment in the United Provinces, and at Amsterdam a strong anti-Stadtholder group; he realised that he might yet find an alliance with Charles II useful in helping to revive the coalition broken up by the separate peace he had been forced to make with Louis XIV. Secondly, if James were excluded, and his wife succeeded Charles, what would be his own position? He was not sure that his influence alone would dominate her. Thirdly, may it not also reasonably be inferred that Mary herself had declared emphatically that such an exclusion would be an 'injustice'? She had a strong affection for her father; her ethical standards were simple; 'thou shalt honour thy father and thy mother' would be to her an imperative command against which considerations of international politics would carry no force. Her religious principles and her strict sense of duty must have had some influence on her husband; although she had not yet reached

[9] Ibid., p. 121.

that stage in her life in which religion became almost an obsession, the ministrations of Compton, Lake, Hooper, and Ken, her spiritual instructors, could not have been without effect.

The English government was not sure that faith could be placed in William's permanent rejection of Exclusionist principles; therefore, probably in order to strengthen his adhesion to the government, the policy of appointing the Princess Mary as regent on the death of Charles II, leaving to James the title of King, was mooted in January, 1681. William was given an outline of the proposals on January 18.[10] It was not until the 29th March that Lawrence Hyde wrote to William holding out the hope of a *joint* regency. In the interval between January and the meeting of the Oxford Parliament in March, Charles concluded a treaty with Louis XIV, by which he arranged to disengage himself from the Spanish alliance on the promise of payment of three million crowns. The detaching of Charles from the anti-Gallican policy which he had more or less consistently followed since Mary's marriage, was a result that the Exclusionists had not anticipated. The ambiguity of William's position doubtless helped to force Charles to take this course. The regency suggestion was not approved by the Oxford Parliament, and because of the violence of the Shaftesbury-Monmouth wing, Charles dissolved it after it had sat for but one week.

During the latter part of 1680, when William was uncertain of the position that would be his if his wife should succeed her uncle on the English throne, Mary and Dr. Ken were occupied in righting what to them seemed a grievous wrong. Count

[10] Jenkins to Orange, quoted by Miss Foxcroft in Life of Halifax, I. 286, from Groen van Prinsterer, 2nd series, V. 472.

Zulestein, a relation of William, had seduced Mary Worth, one of the Princess' ladies. Huyghens, William's secretary, in his diary for October 8, 1680, made the note: 'Sylvius said to me again when I told him that Zulestein spoke ill of Dr. Ken that this was because he had helped to oblige him to declare himself with regard to Mlle. Worth, with whom he had amused himself for a long time.' It should be observed that Ken had only 'helped' to force Zulestein to act as a man of honour. Was Mary's hand in this? On January 28, 1680-1, just after William had heard of the proposal to make Mary regent, the couple were married in the presence of the Princess, William having gone away to Amsterdam to conduct difficult negotiations with those who were there opposing his policy. Why he was so angry when he returned is difficult to understand; there is no evidence that he had planned an advantageous political marriage for Zulestein. Is it not likely that he regarded such acts of independence on the part of his young wife as auguring ill for the time when she might be the ruler of England? The subject of his relations with her if she should succeed to the throne he had never dared to allude to, as he afterwards confessed to Bishop Burnet. His insecurity in this respect, the knowledge that Mary loved her father, who, although excluded, might through her work mischief, caused his manner to her to be often brusque, impatient, and rude, as was the case when he discovered what had happened during his brief visit to Amsterdam. He was even more deeply incensed when Ken refused to receive his dismissal from him, and instead tendered his resignation to the Princess. Mary had no abject fear of William, or she would not have ventured thus to take advantage of his absence to bring about a marriage of which she knew he might dis-

approve. Probably he had before shown irritation at what appeared to him officious meddling on the part of the English divine in the domestic affairs of his own family.

So early as October, 1679, the relations between William and Elizabeth Villiers had been discussed at a dinner party in Paris. William never loved anyone but his wife, but to deny that he had illicit relations with Elizabeth Villiers would be impossible. Whether Mary knew of the infidelity of William before September, 1685, when she was informed of it by agents of James II, who were living in her household, is uncertain. A suspicion of it may have been partly responsible for the illness of March, 1680. There are significant passages in letters written during that summer to Miss Apsley. From childhood they had kept the fiction of writing to each other as husband and wife, the Princess of Orange being the wife. In the rhythm of the sentences, in the very language used during 1680, there is an intensity that before was lacking. A woman, three years married, even a very sentimental woman, is not likely to write to a friend of her own sex reproving a silence of some months in such terms as: 'You are grown inconstant yourself and would be glad of a pretext to fall out, and therefore tax me first with your own fault: take heed itt do nót prove so, for 'tis dangerous to vex a lover and a woman, for you know those are desperate things when they are angry.[11] . . . You are grown so insuportably formall . . . enough to break my heartt, it argus coldness, and when that once comes, I fear nothing but what the thoughts are enough to kill downritt will follow that.'[12] If it be conceded that the Princess knew of the Villiers intrigue, how was she likely to act in response to such knowledge? Did she betray

[11] Letters of Two Queens, Bathurst, p. 123. [12] Ibid., p. 127.

'anger' and 'desperation' to her husband? We think there would be tears and silence and prayers. Current ideas on social morality would be likely to influence somewhat Mary's point of view on this problem. Lord Halifax's 'Advice to a Daughter' gives the typical seventeenth-century attitude, an attitude which doubtless Mary knew well; it was the wife's duty to affect ignorance. William was no hardened sinner, and his shame at his 'secret vice' as Burnet called it, was probably one of the causes of the harshness and coldness which contemporaries noted in his behaviour to his wife. If there was an actual estrangement between the husband and wife during the next few years, it must be attributed both to political and personal causes.

The period of the Tory reaction in England, and of the ascendancy of the Duke of York, coincides with what some writers have regarded as the period of Mary's imprisonment. Miss Strickland says: 'From the year 1680 to 1684, the events of her life in Holland, together with life itself, stagnated as dismally as the contents of the canals around her: all the evidence concerning her goes to prove that her seclusion was little better than the palace-restraint which was called captivity in the days of her ancestresses, Eleanor of Aquitaine and Isabella of Angouleme . . . Some resistance she must have made to the utter subserviency into which she subsequently fell, or there would have been no need of the personal restraint imposed on her.'[13] Miss Strickland uses the authority of D'Avaux, the French Ambassador, for the statement that Mary never left her chamber till eight in the evening, except in summer, when she was permitted to walk about once in seven or eight

[13] Lives of the Queens of England, Strickland, XIII. 79, 92.

days, that no one had liberty to enter her room, not even her lady of honour nor her maids of honour, and that she had a troop of Dutch filles-de-chambre, of which a detachment every day mounted guard on her with orders never to leave her. The trustworthiness of D'Avaux's statements is questionable. Possibly his Gallican intrigues were foiled by the comparative inaccessibility of Mary to him and his confidantes. If Mary's 'seclusion' was deliberately planned by William, which is very doubtful, he was forced to it because he knew that his wife would act independently of any commands he might give her if her conscience and sense of duty were appealed to: he could not yet trust her power of making a right judgment on difficult political questions. In Holland the agents of Louis XIV were working to defeat his dearest projects; in England the reaction from Whiggism had gone very far; and the Duke of York was attending the deliberations of the Privy Council. Two events which will be referred to later, make it certain that James would have welcomed any opportunity of detaching Mary from her loyalty to her husband and to Protestantism. But Mary was not so strictly enclosed as Miss Strickland would have us believe. She wrote in November, 1681, from the Hague to Miss Apsley, speaking of her busy life: 'Since I came to this place, I have never had a minutes time to myself, and now I have not much to spare neithere.' In the following June from 'Houndslerdyck' she laments the fact that she is never long enough in one place to write to her friends; 'whilst I was at Bruxelles I never had time to write neithere to the Duke and Duches nor my sister.' From the Hague in December, 1682, she wrote to Miss Apsley: 'I find with great joy that my dear Aurelia is very happy in a husban wch is the greatest blessing

upon earth, that is certain.'[14] In July, 1683, William wrote to Bentinck giving him a commission to buy a saddle-horse for the Princess. We remember D'Avaux's statement that even in summer she was only allowed to walk about once in seven or eight days!

These years were important for the development of Mary's personality. When she was in the country, her days were spent in working with her hands, in her garden, in reading and devotions, and in entertaining her husband when he was able to spare time from his political responsibilities. Chance allusions in letters written during this period, and the study of her words and actions when it was over, prove that she was wrestling with the problem of two opposing loyalties, and that she was on the way to finding the only possible solution, a religious one. She was barely out of her teens. Her health had suffered considerably since she had left England; the humid air of the lowlands caused ague and fever each summer; she had been disappointed several times after the eager hope of maternity; the dissensions between father and husband, and William's taciturnity and moodiness were causes of grief to her sensitive nature. There is reason to believe that she began at this time to record in a diary the events of her life and her religious experiences. She commissioned her friend, Miss Apsley, to send her a paper book 'with blew tirkey leathere and gilt leaves,' which was obviously to be used for that purpose, of the size of 'Salles introduction to a devout life.' It may be inferred from this that Mary knew something of the devotional writings of ascetics—there are many phrases and allusions in her medita-

[14] Letters of Two Queens, Bathurst, p. 155.

tions that reveal an intimacy with them—and that she was seeking an escape from her difficulties in 'other-worldliness.'

During the early part of 1683, William was again trying to enlist Charles' coöperation in foreign affairs; he aimed at forming an alliance to oppose the dominating power of France. Not only had he many vexations from the political divisions in the United Provinces, but the difficult situation in England caused him anxiety. After the Rye House Plot, William sent Bentinck over to congratulate King Charles and the Duke of York on their escape, yet when Monmouth took refuge in Holland, he was received with distinguished consideration. That there was yet no breach between Mary and her father is proved by the fact that it was he who wrote and told her of the conspiracy. In a letter to her friend, now Lady Bathurst, dated July 27, 1683, there is the statement: 'as for your refering the news of the plot to othere people, I am very well satisfyed because the Duke is pleased to write it to me, and so I am sure to know it, but I always louse of othere things that way for everybody puts me off to better hands as they call it, and so I heer nothing.'[15] Mary was beginning to be interested in events other than those of the social and domestic routine of her household, and her curiosity about affairs was not always satisfied. 'Everybody puts me off to better hands'—probably to those of her husband —'as they call it!' William perhaps deemed it wise to be reticent in expression of opinion concerning English affairs. Mary was in correspondence with her father, and between husband and father there was a latent antagonism.

Dr. Covel, one of Mary's chaplains, sent occasional letters to the Bishop of London containing references to the Princess

[15] Letters of Two Queens, Bathurst, p. 172.

which serve to illuminate her life in Holland during these years. 'I received your Lordship's present to her Royal Highness; there was no need of new binding them, for she is not as other women, to regard the outside of bookes more than the inside. She commands me to thank you for them with all hearty respect. I read the sermon to her the day that it came, and she was extreamely wel pleased and satisfyed with it.'[16] Mary was seeking in religion consolation for her husband's faithlessness: her Protestantism, which was unassailable and founded on firm conviction, prevented the development of more confidential relations with her father. During the time that Monmouth was at the Hague, James wrote more than once to Mary expostulating about the hospitality that was given to him; he supposed that she was kept in awe. She denied this, and declared that she was much happier than he believed.

Two events of outstanding importance occurred during the year 1685. Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes, and thousands of Protestant refugees found their way into England and Holland. James II succeeded to the English throne and began his policy of making himself absolute, and of bringing England into subjection to the Roman see. Mary was the direct heir to the throne, and the consciousness of this must have caused her often to think of herself as filling that regal position. Another fact of importance in Mary's life should be mentioned: William now stood out as the natural champion of Protestantism in Europe.

In September, 1685, agents of James II, who were living in the Princess' household, informed her of her husband's infidelity. This was the first of two attempts on the part of her father for

[16] Bodl. Rawl. C 983, f. 97.

victory in the conflict against the forces which her husband represented. Mary waited one night where she might see William on his way to the apartments of her maids of honour. She then acted with decision. Before the 11th October, during the absence of William, Elizabeth Villiers had been sent back to London.[17] When her father wrote to the Prince and Princess of Orange, begging them to take her back, the Princess refused to receive her. William then set himself to discover who had been Mary's informants, and a letter from her court-chaplain to Skelton, the English envoy, was intercepted: 'The Princess' heart is like to break yet she . . . counterfeits the greatest joy, and looks upon us as dogged as may be: the Prince hath infallibly made her a complete slave and there's an end of it . . . We dare no more speak to her.'[18] This is admirable testimony to the courage and dignity that Mary showed before her attendants. Her strength of character was made evident at this time of severe trial. What can be thought of a father, himself not immaculate, who would wound so deeply a daughter by causing a servant to reveal to her the unchastity of her husband?

Mary's zeal for Protestantism was deepened during this time by the stories she heard from French refugees. A certain 'Monsieur de B.,' who frequented her court, reported in his memoirs: 'Elle établit une société de filles de bonne famille de Françoises réfugiées, qu'elle entretenoit en partie: elle les alloit voir souvent, travailloit avec elles et entroit dans le détail de touts leurs petits besoins, qu'elle soulageoit d'une bonté charmante et qui lui gagnoit touts les coeurs.'[19] D'Avaux, the French Ambassador, complained to the Prince that Mary was

[17] Letter from Bentinck to Sidney, Bentinck and William III, by Grew, p. 91.
[18] Rochester Corres., I. 165. [19] Memoirs de Monsieur de B., p. 83.

repeating some of the stories of cruelty and persecution she had heard, and requested him to restrain her from talking thus. The Prince coldly replied that he could not.[20] During the same month, January, 1686, M. D'Albeville reported to D'Avaux a conversation that William and Mary had had with the famous Quaker, William Penn, about the Declaration of Indulgence. William declared that 'he would lose all the revenues and reversion of the Kingdom of Great Britain to which his wife was heiress' before one of the penal laws should be abolished. The Princess echoed his words, but much more at length, and with such sharpness that D'Albeville was much astonished at her tone and manner. She concluded by saying that if ever she was Queen of England 'she should do more for the Protestants than even Queen Elizabeth.'[21] There is a suggestion here of the over-emphasis of an emotional nature in a state of high tension. The concentration of mental energy on the religious aspect of her problem is becoming more and more apparent, and there is little doubt that the visit to the Hague of Bishop Burnet in the summer of 1686 gave the final direction to this development.

Dr. Stanley, who was appointed as Mary's chaplain at the end of 1685, wrote to the Bishop of London on December 22: 'I confess that I have found a kinder reception than I expected, and all things as agreeable as I can desire. Her Highness is doubtless one of the best tempered persons in the world, and everyone must needs be happy in serving her. . . I think we are all bound in a special manner both to pray and give thanks for her.'[22] It is possible that more cordial relations were begin-

[20] Ambassades D'Avaux, V. 219. [21] Ibid., p. 67.
[22] Bodl. Rawl. C 983, f. 107.

ning between the Prince and Princess. William's Protestantism was the chief support that his personality possessed in retaining the whole-hearted allegiance of his wife. From the time when her father began to try to catholicise England, all the emotional force of her nature, the expression of both religious and natural instinct, was directed towards her husband. He then appeared to her not only as the champion of Protestantism in Europe, but as its defender in her own country. The events of 1686 were important in their influence on this transition.

To Bishop Burnet Mary gave the impression that she knew little of English affairs. He noted particularly her silence and reserve. It is probably true that she knew little of the position of parties in England and of the trend of public opinion, but she had heard of the Exclusion Bill and the Rye House Plot. She may have deemed it wise to display a cautious reticence which misled the Bishop. He laid before her the state of the English Court and the intrigues in it since the Restoration, 'which she received with great satisfaction and showed true judgment and a good mind in all the reflections that she made.'[23]

Burnet held a conversation of some hours' continuance on constitutional and ecclesiastical matters with the Prince in the presence of the Princess. He advised William to put the fleet of Holland in a good condition, and suggested their writing to the Bishop of London, and to James concerning him. A more exact statement of the nature of Burnet's advice is contained in a pamphlet letter written by the Bishop, to which Dr. Hickes, the nonjuror, made reference in his reply thereto: 'He saith that he saw her in September, 1686, upon the occasion of the High Commission, and the prosecution of the Bishop of London,

[23] Hist. of My Own Times, Burnet, III. 134.

when some thought all was gone and violent remedies were necessary, but he distinguished between illegal acts and a subversion to which he thought things would grow, but till that appeared he thought it not lawful to go to violent methods, i.e. to an invasion.'[24]

Then followed the well-known episode of Mary's resignation of her rights into the hands of her husband. When Burnet asked her what she intended the Prince should be, if she should come to the throne, she did not at first understand his meaning. After stating that such a nominal dignity as a titular kingship might endanger the real one that the Prince had in Holland, Burnet made his impudent proposition that, if she could bring her mind to it, she should be contented to be William's wife and endeavour to get the real authority of the English crown legally vested in him for life: 'This would lay . . . the foundation of a perfect union between them which had been of late a little embroiled.'[25] The next day William received his wife's graceful resignation,—an act which was of itself evidence of strength rather than of weakness. Two facts clearly emerge: Mary had always in thought identified her husband with herself in the possession and use of the regal power she was to inherit; to William, she had never been simply his wife, the Princess of Orange, but always the future Queen of England who might one day wield a power greater than his own. For nine years he had never had the courage, as he told Burnet, to discuss with her their future relationships. He intuitively perceived a fine and delicate strength and a spiritual reserve in his wife that baffled him. It is impossible to decide how far William, directly or indirectly, suggested Burnet's interference. The

[24] Bodl. Rawl. D 841, p. 32. [25] Hist. of My Own Times, Burnet, III. 138.

Bishop's testimony is to the effect that his act was spontaneous and uninspired. He expressed his opinion of the Princess in September, 1686, in a letter to the Principal of Glasgow University: 'I will assure you that upon so large a knowledge as almost is possible for me to arrive to in so short a time of the Princess here, she is the most wonderful person that I ever knew. She has a true and a generous notion of the Christian religion, and her life is an example to all the world. She has a modesty, a sweetness, and a humility in her that cannot be enough admired. She has a vast understanding and knows a great deal.'[26]

Mary has left no record of her thoughts concerning the events that occurred during Burnet's visit, but a letter commiserating the death of a child of Lady Bathurst's, written in the following month, gives some indication of the direction her mind was taking. 'Children who dy before thay are capable of sining are I think very hapy being onely taken out of a troblesome world wch few who know it perfectly, if thay had nothing thay loved in it woud be sorry to leave, and if one coud hinder oneself seting ones heart to much upon those we love we shoud be the redyer to dy.' Then, referring to the advantageous marriage of a niece: 'Tho, in one respect, I shoud think it very much the contrary since he is of anothere religion, and I think that ought ever to be the chife and therefore, cant chuse but wonder at such a choise, or how any can prefer wordly advantages to that.'[27] These simple words reveal Mary in the maturity of her mind and spirit, and it is at once apparent that a wide gulf separates the woman from the child whom William

[26] Foxcroft's Life of Burnet, p. 223.
[27] Letters of Two Queens, Bathurst, p. 198.

married. She had inherited something of the Stuart tendency to over-amorousness, and this then expressed itself innocently enough in a simple and whole-hearted surrender of herself to her husband, but why was it that after one reference to her affection for him and her anxiety for his safety in a letter to Miss Apsley a few months after her marriage, she never alluded to him until the middle of 1684? The occurrences of these years, if we could but fully know them, would explain the change in the personality of the Princess. She had grappled with complex and difficult problems, and this had developed qualities that before were latent. Sorrow had been experienced, but life had given its most blessed gift, the power of estimating values truly.

One result of Burnet's visit was perhaps that the Princess had a clearer realisation of the responsibilities that lay before her. Dr Stanley wrote to Compton on March 21, 1686-7: 'I may tell your Lordship that she is pleased often to send for me to inform her of the affairs of England, as to its constitution and government, both in Church and State, which is very fit for her to know . . . I pray God that all things may work together for the good of this most excellent Princess, and of the church and nation under her.'[28]

The events of the year 1685 in England and France which helped so much the solution of Mary's problem, and made her identify herself permanently with the cause of Protestantism and William, had other results in the United Provinces which were no less important. Anti-French feeling grew rapidly: D'Avaux's insidious influence lessened; and William was able in August, 1686, to conclude the League of Augsburg against France, and thus become, at the moment of Burnet's visit and

[28] Bodl. Rawl. C 983, p. 110.

Mary's resignation of her rights, the official champion of Protestantism in Europe. England's exclusion was the chief weakness of the new Alliance. William realised after the failure of Dykevelt's mission in the early months of 1687 that it was hopeless to try to detach James from the French interest, and from this time may be dated the beginning of a definite conspiracy between William and the Opposition Lords in England, —a conspiracy which was to end in an international event of great magnitude, the Revolution of 1688.

The forces of reaction in England, however, were to make another bid for victory. James tried once more to divert Mary from her allegiance to Protestantism and William. The controversial correspondence that took place between father and daughter in the last months of 1687 cannot here be given.[29] The respectful tone that Mary adopted towards her father should be remarked upon, however, as also should be her assertion that she had provided herself with books the reading of which had convinced her of the truth of the faith in which she had been educated. She argued clearly and logically, and showed an understanding of the main points at issue between the churches. She had not, of course, the subtlety of the philosopher or of the trained theologian, but in these letters she revealed the possession of a strong, simple, and honest mind. William, Dr. Burnet, and Dr. Stanley saw Mary's correspondence, and their opinion is on record. It gave to Burnet 'an astonishing joy to see so young a person, all of the sudden, without consulting any one person to be able to write so solid and learned a letter. . . . Her repulsing the attack that the King made upon her with so much resolution and force did let the Popish party see that

[29] Extracts will be found in the Appendix on page 205.

she understood her religion as well as she loved it.'[30] On the 24th January, 1688, Dr. Stanley reported the correspondence to Archbishop Sancroft: 'Our excellent Princess . . . was resolved to write an answer herself, as her father desired, without consulting any of us . . . she wrote a letter to King James . . . (which she afterwards read to me) which truly I can say without flattery was the best letter I ever saw, treating King James with that respect which became her father and her King, and yet speaking her mind freely and openly as became the cause of religion.'[31] Mary has left in her diary a naive reference to William's surprise at the revelation of her controversial powers: 'ne me croyant capable d'une telle chose, que j'avoue que cela me flatta pas peu ma vanité.'[32]

Mary's comment in this diary—which was for no eye but her own—on the possibility of the birth of a son to James II, of which public proclamation was made on December 13, 1687, is significant: 'Je rend grâces à mon Dieu, que cette nouvelle ne me trouble en aucune façon, Dieu m'ayant donnée un esprit content, et point d'ambition que celle de servir mon Créateur et de conserver mon honneur sans tache . . . Dans l'état où je suis je puis mieux le servir que si j'étois dans un poste plus éminent en sorte, ne fut-ce que par rapport à moi seule, je souhaiteray, autant que le Roy lui-même, qu'il eut un fils. Mais pendant que j'étois aussi indifférente pour moi-même, je trouvay que je ne pus le démeurer longtems puisque l'intérêt de la Religion Protestante en dépend . . . Cela me tira donc de la douce et satisfaisant tranquilité dont je jouissois, et me fit voire combien j'étois obligée à souhaiter que je puisse parvenir à

[30] Hist. of My Own Times, Burnet, III. 204.
[31] Clarendon Diary and Letters, IV. 486 f.
[32] Memoires et Lettres, ed. Bentinck, p. 60.

la Couronne. Outre l'intérêt de l'Eglise, l'amour que j'ay pour le Prince me porte à lui souhaiter tout ce qu'il mérite. Et bien que je regrette de n'avoir que trois couronnes à lui porter, ce n'est point mon amour qui m'aveugle; non, je puis voire ses fautes, mais je dis cecy parceque je connais aussi ses merites.'[33] The sincerity of this passage in unquestionable. Her sense of having what she regarded as a divine mission is clearly revealed, and her strong belief in this was the psychological cause of her so readily giving credence to the story of the suppositious birth. It cannot be too much emphasised that Mary never believed in the legitimacy of the Prince of Wales.

The events of that summer may well be related in Mary's words: 'Dans ce temps-la, le Roy commençait plus à sa découvrir qu'il ne l'avoit fait encore, en envoyant 7 Evêques dans la Tour. Le peuple pensa que c'étoit beaucoup hazardé avant qu'il sçut s'il auroit un fils ou non. Mais ce fils venant après cela si subitement, donna lieu à soubconner un mauvais jeu . . . Je rends grâces à Dieu pour le Prince et moy, qu'aucun de nous ne soit en peine pour notre proper intérêt; notre unique soucy est pour l'Eglise de Dieu, mais pour ce qui la regarde nous mettons notre confiance en luy.'[34]

On the 30th June, the seven Bishops were acquitted, and the letter of invitation to William was signed at the house of Lord Shrewsbury. Mary's comment upon the preparations that were begun for her husband's departure from Holland is: 'Je ne sçavois comment à supporter l'enterprise dont le Prince étoit occupé . . . je n'ouvre mon coeur à personne, et me contrains à paraitre, aux yeux de tout le monde hormis le Prince aussi

[33] Memoires et Lettres, ed. Bentinck, p. 63. [34] Ibid., pp. 72 f.

joyeuse et contente qu il m'est possible.'[35] Before sailing, William reminded her that if he should not live to return, it would be necessary for her to marry again, and that her second husband should be a Protestant. 'Il ne put lui-même prononcer ces paroles sans répandre des larmes, et pendant tout cet entretien, il me témoigna autant de tendresse que je pus désirer . . . Il me protesta qu'uniquement les soucis qu'il avoit pour la Religion le faisoit parler ainsi.'[36] Mary accompanied her husband to the place of his departure for Brill. 'C'est la où je le vis pour la derniére fois, et Dieu seul sçait si nous nous reverrons jamais.'[37]

The important events of the next few months in Holland can be related in few words. James made several attempts to persuade his daughter of the iniquity of her husband's action. He caused D'Albeville to visit her in the hope of convincing her of the legitimacy of the Prince of Wales. The envoy's letter to Lord Preston, in which he reported the result of his mission, is extant: 'This afternoon her R. Highness was pleased to send me . . . this message, that she does not wonder at all after what has been publicly talked of and generally believed . . . the King should think of means to convince the world to the contrary; but as for her, that she thinks she neither can at this distance, nor ought in other respects judge of it . . . It is of a nature that nothing but a Parliament can satisfy therein the minds of everybody.'[38] The irony of a daughter of the Stuarts thus referring this issue to the bar of Parliament!

Mary spent much time during these months in prayer and

[35] Ibid., p. 78. [36] Memoires et Lettres, ed. Bentinck, p. 81. [37] Ibid., p. 82.
[38] Graham MSS, p. 423; Hist. MSS Comm., App. to 7th Rep.

meditation. Nevertheless, the summons to England contained in a letter from William brought to her on the 1st February, 1689, by Admiral Herbert, perturbed her considerably. Her memoirs record that, upon receipt of the letter, she spent a sleepless night. Her situation presented itself to her in all its poignant sadness. In Holland the people had been loving and gracious to her, and she stood high in their regard. In England she had not set foot since she went away at the age of fifteen years; would she be held in equal honour by her own countrymen? She longed to be spared the ordeal that lay before her. In her memoirs she used the word 'passion' to describe the anguish of soul she experienced until her religious faith strengthened her. 'I saw my fault, and asked pardon of my God, and asked him to give me a more resigned will.'[39]

The Princess sailed from Holland on Saturday, February 9th, but the royal yacht with its attendant men-of-war lay at anchor in the Meuse until noon on Sunday, detained by stormy weather. In the early hours of Monday morning, a vague dark mass was discernible on the horizon. 'It would be hard for me to express the different motions I felt in my heart at the sight of my own native country . . . When I saw England . . . which long absence had made me a stranger to, I felt a secret joy which doubtless proceeded from a natural sympathy.'[40] The sentiment of patriotism which Mary thus named so well, and the joy to which it gave birth, were followed by a feeling of pride that she should soon see her husband owned as the deliverer of her country—'but alas! poor mortal, from whom has he delivered it but from thy father!'[41]

[39] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 7.
[40] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, pp. 9f.
[41] Ibid., p. 10.

CHAPTER TWO

THE FIRST YEAR AS QUEEN

On the 31st January, 1689, the state of politics was such that it seemed likely that Mary would be placed alone on the throne of her fathers. There are three well-marked steps in the transition from the vagueness and uncertainty that characterised political opinion in December. Before the end of this month, there was a proposal from a group in the House of Lords to proclaim Mary Queen, but this was defeated by a coalition of the Regency party with the Orange Whigs. On the 29th January, Regency was discussed by the Lords; it was defeated by another coalition—this time that of the pro-Mary Tories with the Orange Whigs—by a narrow majority of two. Many of the regency party then joined issues with those whom they had opposed in December, with the result that there was a strong consensus of opinion in the Upper House in support of the Princess' title. On the 28th January, the Commons had voted the throne vacant; on the 31st, by a majority of five votes, the Lords declared that the throne was not vacant. One compromise only was possible; the proclamation of Mary as Queen.

At the end of December William told Halifax that he would not stay in England if James were restored, nor would he be regent. Within a day or two of the deadlock that occurred in the Convention at the end of January, William announced that he would neither be regent nor Prince-consort. A comparison of these statements will reveal William's response to current political events. Then came the proposal from Halifax to vest the Crown-Imperial in the Prince alone, followed by the con-

versation between Bentinck and Burnet, in which the former seemed to be 'possessed with the idea.'[1] A project so much in opposition to national sentiment could not have succeeded, and its abandonment was wise. At this juncture, what diverted political opinion in favour of a joint monarchy?

Danby was probably right in believing, when he arrived in London on the 26th December, that he could set Mary alone on the throne. The story of his letter to her and her reply is well known.[2] Even after this expression of her opinion her adherents were still regarding her accession as the only solution of their problem. Then came Burnet's announcement of her resignation of 1686. It was this statement of her will, following as it did her rebuke to Danby, which made helpless the increasing number of her supporters in the Upper House. France was preparing for war; it was imperative that there should be a settled government; so on Ash Wednesday, the 13th February, the crown was formally offered to William and Mary by the Marquis of Halifax in the name of both Houses.

Upon arrival the day before, Mary was received at Greenwich Palace by the Prince and Princess of Denmark. She then went by barge to Whitehall, amidst loud acclamation. It is probable that the high-spirited gaiety that she displayed during the first days was assumed, but it deceived many. Burnet even expostulated with her, and then was told that she had been

[1] To Bentinck's arguments: 'I answered with some vehemence that this was a very ill return for the steps the Princess had made to the Prince three years ago . . . It would meet with great opposition, and give a general ill impression of the Prince as insatiable and jealous in his ambition' (Hist. of My Own Times, III. 391).

[2] Burnet is the only authority for the truth of this story, as also for that of the 'resignation.' Why did Mary think neither event of sufficient importance to record in her Memoirs?

warned by letters from England not to exhibit a gravity of mien, lest it should be misinterpreted. Unfortunately, her behaviour was regarded by some as revealing the great delight she had to be Queen,—'alas! they did little know me who thought me guilty of that; I had been only for a regency . . . the good of the public was to be preferd . . . and I protest, God knows my heart, that what I say is true, that I have had more trouble to bring myself to bear this so envyed estate than I should have had to have been reduced to the lowest condition. . . . My heart is not made for a kingdom, and my inclination leads me to a retired quiet life, so that I have need of all the resignation and self-denial in the world to bear with such a condition as I am now in.'[3]

The Queen was at once the cynosure of all eyes. On the evening of the 13th February, Lady Cavendish 'went to court with my Lady Devonshire, and kissed the Queen's hand and the King's also. There was a world of bonfires, and candles almost in every house, which looked extremely pretty . . . As for the Queen, she is really altogether very handsome; her face is very agreeable, and her shape and motions extremely graceful and fine. She is tall, but not so tall as the last Queen. Her room was mighty full of company, as you may guess.'[4]

Mary did not find easy the adjustment of herself to her changed circumstances. The 'noisy world full of vanity' was different indeed from the almost conventual atmosphere of her home in Holland. Instead of having public prayers four times a day, in England she had hardly leisure to go twice; and Sunday was made 'idle' for her by the company who then thronged her drawing-room. At the beginning of March, she

[3] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 11. [4] Letters of Lady Rachel Russell, I. 270 f.

went to Hampton Court, where 'I got leisure for a little serious reflection and writ my mind down.'[5] She thus wrote to a Dutch friend: 'Je suis présentement à la compagne, à un lieu qui a esté fort négligé . . . l'air y est fort bon . . . je n'ay pas encore eu le temps de parler au Roy pour vostre dame réfugiée . . . c'est la multitude d'affaires que le Roy a sur le bras qui m'empêche . . . de lui parler de ce que [Mlle. d'Aujane] m'avoit proposée, mais . . . je ne manqueray pas de le faire . . . je ne dis rien des pauvres réfugiées. Vous en aurez soin.'[6] It is evident that Mary, in spite of the pressure of distasteful social duties, tried to find time for consideration of matters of wider import, and that she was regarded in Holland as a natural means of approach to the King.

On Good Friday Mary 'writt down a confession and a prayer fit for the time,' and on Easter Sunday she and the King received the sacrament together at Hampton Court. At the beginning of April her thoughts were much occupied with the coronation ceremony. 'The coronation came on; that was to be all vanity, yet . . . they made some very good alterations in the Office.'[7] She composed a special prayer in preparation for the day: 'I also composed some ejaculations which I used at the time of the coronation.'[8]

Was national sentiment wholly in support of the new régime? In the minds of liberal Protestants, the religion of William

[5] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 12. [6] Memoires et Lettres, Bentinck, p. 116.
[7] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 12.
[8] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 13. The report, supposed to be in the handwriting of Nottingham, that Mary this summer visited fortune tellers, and was seen at a theatre in confusion at the political allusions in the play, is untrue. Lord Hardwicke's comment upon this is: 'A Secretary of State would never write such tittle-tattle, and the handwriting is very unlike his' (Brit. Mus. Add. 34195, f. 103).

more than outweighed his Dutch extraction, but what may be said of that section of the community who had no strong religious instinct, and of those who were bitterly opposed to all forms of dissent? The amateur political thinkers of the towns and villages doubtless identified themselves with the cause of William, because he was the safeguard of constitutional government. It is unquestionable, however, that the country clergy, educated in doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistence, were responsible for much of the prevalent anti-Williamite feeling. What of those whose main interest was necessarily economic? The comparative security enjoyed under James' government was more valuable to some than the constitutional privileges and religious freedom guaranteed by the new monarchs, to ensure the permanence of which England was about to be plunged into war. The strongest Jacobite sympathy was not found always in districts predominantly Roman Catholic. There was conflict in the streets of Stamford on Coronation Day. The Mayor and 'other disaffected people' tried to stop the festivities with 'the water-engine and the militia.' The soldiers threatened to shoot 'all the Presbyterian rogues out of the street.' Much disorder followed. Shots were fired, and the Mayor even attempted to hang one of the aldermen who remonstrated,—'those that were assistant to King William and Queen Mary were rogues and rebels. The parson . . . said so too . . . and they drank a health to the old gentleman.'[9] On the same day the Governor of Upnor Castle, 'with two officers of the customs and a gunner, solemnly drank to King James 'on their knees,' and maledictory toasts were offered to the Prince of Orange in a tavern at Rochester.[10] In

[9] C. S. P. Dom. 1689-90, p. 61. [10] Ibid., p. 257.

the first week in May the town of Alresford was burnt, and information was received of 'like practices from other parts.'[11] Letters form Carlisle proved that the borderers were nearly all engaged against William and Mary. Sir John Lowther wrote of their having been 'strangely poisoned.' Arms and men were sent into Lancashire and North Wales. The 'well-affected' in Herefordshire and the Midlands were reputed to be but 'few in number.' During the year 'protections' were given to many persons apprehensive of molestation, many warrants for arrest were issued, a strict eye was ordered to be kept upon 'the coffee house of Gosneyes . . . Tom's Coffee House . . . and the Dog Tavern in Drury Lane.'[12] The abuse of passes, the circulation of seditious papers and books, and the obtrusion of libels 'upon all kinds of people in most parts of the Kingdom' are mentioned in the records. The facts here adduced, taken from the Calendar of State Papers, should be considered when studying the transition in William's political outlook during 1689. The evidence of this strong and widespread opposition to him was more obvious to the government in the first year than was the glad acceptance of his dominion on the part of many which was none the less real.

William cared little for parties, and his first ministry was a coalition. Early in March, Nottingham and Danby brought in the Bills of Comprehension and Toleration, and forthwith began a duel between the Tories and the Whigs. The introduction of the Bills for the new oaths of allegiance and supremacy was followed by William's very impolitic proposal to repeal the Test Act. It seemed as though he was leaning towards the Whigs, but the fanatical opposition to this measure

[11] Ibid., p. 94. [12] C. S. P. Dom. 1689-90, p. 53.

by Tories everywhere made him hesitate. By the middle of the year it was not obvious which party was to be dominant; the Test Act was to be maintained, but the Oaths were to be compulsory on the Clergy. In this fight for place and power, for such it was, each party strove to force an adjustment of the King's will. The need of having to work with two factions bitterly opposed to each other made it impossible for the King to maintain a non-party attitude: one of two political courses was possible. He might ally himself definitely with the Whig party, but his almost unreasonable fear of republicanism, which was played upon by Tory politicians, prevented this.[13] Moreover, his open identification of himself with the Whig cause would have greatly increased Jacobite zeal, probably in his eyes dangerous enough already to the stability of the new settlement. Was he then to ally himself with the Tories? On the 24th June he made his remark to Halifax that 'if he left us, the Queen would governe us better.'[14] She might unite the Tories, and even detach some of the Jacobites from their loyalty to her father. To retain his crown, and therefore his position in Europe, William must placate the party whose tradition was one of allegiance to the monarchical principle, and to divine right, and yet his claim to their loyalty was in the eyes of many of them of a dubious nature, in spite of the 'de facto' compromise. At length he accepted heroically the fact that it was his *wife's* claim to their allegiance that made possible his own, but the situation to the proud and despotic

[13] To Halifax during this summer, the King alluded to his suspicion that Monmouth was setting himself up as the head of a republican party.

[14] Foxcroft's Life of Halifax, II. 222. Burnet says that William fancied the Church party would trust the Queen—though they would not him (Supplement, p. 338).

man was extremely distasteful.[15] On the 28th July, Halifax saw what he regarded as the first indication of William's turning to the 'Church party.' On the same day the King expressed the opinion that it would be best 'to name him single' in the treaty with the States regulating conditions of naval warfare, which was signed on August 12-22. Ten days later he observed to Halifax that Monmouth's 'wife governed him,' two remarks which betrayed an uneasy and resentful consciousness. Halifax records elsewhere that William had 'a great jealousie of *being thought* to be governed.'[16] There was danger in being 'governed' by the Whigs; hence the turning to the Tories, which is so conspicious a feature of the political history of the latter part of 1689, with its implicit recognition of Mary's real position. She alone, in the words of a recent writer, 'could salve the conscience of the churchman, silence the objections of the lawyer, save hereditary right, and break the schemes of the republicans.'[17]

Mary was not entirely ignorant of the difficulties with which her husband was contending. 'The King was blamed for many things . . . things went on so ill in Scotland and Ireland, and sometimes I was almost in despair.'[18] There was no swerving from the conviction, however, that she and her husband had done right. She wrote at the end of May to Sophia of Hanover: 'Je ne doute pas de la justice de vos sentiments, et j'espère que les miens sont raisonables, ayant beaucoup à souffrir pour les malheurs d'un père. Mais cela ne m'empêche pas de me ré-

[15] Why otherwise did he make that bold bid, which Burnet records so indignantly, to accede alone to the throne, at a time when a substantial majority in the Lords were in favour of Mary's title?

[16] Foxcroft's Life of Halifax, II. 203.

[17] K. Fielding, The Tory Party, p. 252. [18] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 14.

jouir du bien public et la satisfaction que j'ay d'avoir un mary qui a fait son devoir, et de n'y avoir pas manqué moy-même, est assez grande pour me donner beaucoup de repos d'esprit.'[19]

Most of the summer was spent at Hampton Court, and Mary regrets in her Memoirs the misfortune of the King's ill-health which prevented his living at Whitehall,—'it put people out of humour being here naturally lazy.'[20] William discussed the question of a residence with Halifax in May,—'the Queen was extreamly for Kensington, but he was against it.'[21] Lord Nottingham's house was bought, in spite of the King's opposition, but since it could not be ready for habitation until December, Holland House was borrowed from the middle of October,—'there the Lord gave me grace to spend my time well.'[22] On the King's birthday a ball was held at Mary's desire, 'though I really thought it no proper time, when war was round about, and my father himself ingaged against us.[23] This is a thing of such a nature as I thinck should inspire us onely with prayers . . . yet such is the depravation of this age and place . . . none seem to think of such things.'[24] Mary felt unsettled at Holland House, and made many visits to Kensington during the autumn to hasten the workmen there, but it was not until the 23rd December that it was ready for their reception. At the end of the year she made her customary meditation: 'I am come to the crown and so raised to the greatest condition of human life, which it may be would be thought a happiness by many, but I don't loock on it as such. My quality before . . . was enough to satisfy the proudest

[19] Memoires et Lettres, Bentinck, p. 105.
[20] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 15.
[21] Foxcroft's Life of Halifax, II. 218.
[22] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 15.
[23] James landed in Ireland in March, 1689.
[24] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 16.

person, and the prospect of a crown was to my thincking better than the possession of it. . . . The only thing that pleases me is the hopes of being in time together with my husband the instrument of good in God's hand. . . As for the life I have led, it has been very unpleasant to me, not agreeing with my humour . . . as it is not my inclination to medle in business, so I thinck the prudentst thing I can do is to let it alone. . . For beside my not understanding those matters, there are abundance of bussie people in the world,who would endeavour, as I have but too much found already, to make divisions and mischief.'[25]

It is true that there is little to record of Mary's activities in public affairs during this year. William revealed to Halifax in August that the Queen, at the suggestion of Burnet, had discussed bringing Lord Rochester, her uncle, into business, but 'the King seemed resolved against it.'[26] A week later William betrayed disinclination to employ 'Lord Inchiqueen.' On the 11th September the latter was made Governor of Jamaica, and Burnet suggests that it was by the Queen's intervention.

The trend of affairs in Scotland was in some respects analogous to that in England. Parliament met on the 5th June in Edinburgh. The Whigs alone were heartily in favour of the new settlement: they hoped to increase the power of Parliament, to curtail the prerogative, and to establish Presbyterianism. The Tories, composed chiefly of the higher nobility, were Episcopalian, and many of them openly Jacobite. Then there were the professional politicians, who were dominated by self-interest rather than by principle. If to them had been

[25] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 20. [26] Foxcroft's Life of Halifax, II. 232.

given the remunerative offices of state to which they considered their powers entitled them, they would doubtless have thrown the full weight of their influence on the side of William and Mary, but the Duke of Hamilton became Royal Commissioner, Lord Crawford was made President, and the Secretary was Lord Melvill, a moderate Whig. William, realizing that the stability of his government in Scotland depended upon the support of Presbyterians, had agreed to the establishment of Presbyterianism. What was actually accomplished in 1689 was merely the dethronement of Episcopacy. The disappointed office seekers had now an opportunity of venting their jealous anger against crown officials by organising an opposition party and posing as the enemies of the prerogative and the champions of Presbyterianism. They began to meet secretly for discussion.

A letter to a Scotch Jacobite intercepted at the end of 1689 reveals something of the Whig point of view. The subterfuge is adopted of writing as if in the Whig interest. 'We have great fears for ourselves at present; people begin to see themselves too far cheated, and since the news of Ireland, we have lost thousands of friends, nay, to that height that our Parliament men have said they saw no remedy but their calling the old gentleman. Judge where we are when such things go about, nay, the people in the streets talk to such purposes.'[27] There is little doubt that this is a true expression of Whig feeling, in view of the position of parties at the end of 1689 and the consternation in the minds of the Whigs at the Tory reaction. In their anger the Whigs in the New Year made many mistakes. William assisted the Tories to defeat the Whig Corporation

[27] C. S. P. Dom. 1689-90, p. 325. The writer of this letter is David Lindsey, one time servant of the Earl of Melfort, and a Jacobite spy.

Bill, with its famous Sacheverell clause, and on the 6th February dissolved Parliament. In the elections of February and March many Whigs lost their seats, and some of the party began to discuss projects for revenge.

The chief events of importance in international affairs during 1689 were the attempts of Louis and James to proclaim themselves leaders of a Catholic crusade in Europe, and the formation of the Grand Alliance, in which Brandenburg, the Empire, Savoy, Spain, and the Dutch States arrayed themselves with England against France, a proof that Europe realised that Louis' real aims were not religious but political.

William, by his accession to the English throne, had command over a triple kingdom, Ireland, Great Britain, and Holland, and in the subsequent war with France, his task was to secure control of the English and the Irish Channels and to defend the Dutch States from French invasion by keeping an army in the Spanish Netherlands.

In March, 1689, James II landed in Ireland and was there received with great enthusiasm. Louis wanted to make Ireland the centre of conflict for William, in order that he might be free to pursue his aggressive designs against Germany. Soon after, Dundee fled from Edinburgh to raise the Highlands for James. In August the non-juring schism began. The odds against William were great.

At the beginning of 1690 William decided to go in person to Ireland. Burnet went to Mary in great concern to know if the government were to be left in her hands. She did not think it 'kind' to her husband to concern herself in such a matter, but when the Bishop of Asaph referred to the sadness of her husband and her father being personally engaged against each

other, she spoke to the King, who told her that he would go if the necessities of affairs required it. William's thoughts were much preoccupied during these weeks on the problem of administration during his absence. On the 23rd January he told Halifax that 'there must bee a councell to governe . . . the Queen is not to meddle.'[28] Later came the further remark that the Queen was not to sit in the commission, but that an account was to be given her,—'shee must not controule what they do.'[29]

At the prorogation of Parliament on the 27th January, William announced his intention of going to Ireland. Mary then 'fell into a great melancholy.' The King said much to satisfy her, but would not depart from his decision. 'It was but the same thing he had begon before, and must now be finisht.'[30] Shall business be left in the hands of the Privy Council, who will acquaint you with all things?—or will you accept the responsibility of government? Such in effect were the questions that William then placed before the Queen. Her response was that as she was 'wholy a stranger to bussiness, the Privy Council must do all things . . . I really left the thing to him, and would make no choice . . . I only desired he would take care I should not make a foolish figure in the world.'[31] The King gave her a 'very kind answer.'

William evidently made the decision that his wife was not to take an active part in the government, for on the 5th February he showed Halifax a list of those who were to manage affairs in his absence. 'The Queen was not to sit, but an account was to be given her . . . (was troubled how to adjust that matter).'[32]

[28] Foxcroft's Life of Halifax, II. 246.
[29] Ibid., p. 247.
[30] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 22.
[31] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 22.
[32] Life of Halifax, II. 248.

Yet he declared when Parliament assembled at the end of March that the government was to be left in her hands. To what may be attributed this change? Mary's plainly expressed fear of the responsibility may have influenced the King, but it is not unreasonable to believe that political considerations determined him.

The Queen had three months in which to prepare herself for what was actually a very onerous task. 'My opinion having ever been that women should not medle in government, I have never given myself to be inquisitive into those kind of matters. I have this notion fully fixt in my mind that, all wisedom being the gift of God, he does impart it where he sees it necessary . . . tho' there does not want those that would make me medle in hopes to do mischief that way, and sometimes tell me that I may come to govern alone, yet I am so persuaded that, if ever it pleased God to send that great misfortune, he would then . . . direct me how to behave myself.'[33] Many meditations upon the grave responsibilities of government were written by Mary during these months. 'Upon everything that happend I prayed and meditated, and found myself grow in grace, for which for ever blessed be the name of God.'[34] Yet it is certain that she had an almost morbid fear of the work that lay before her: all the 'crosses' she had met with had made her 'melancholy' and 'very indifferent to life.'[35] This she found 'by a sore throat' she had, which caused her to think herself in danger of death. 'I . . . endeavoured . . . to set my things in order, and Monday found myself so ill that I did believe I should dye, and was so well satisfied with it, that I was really rather glad than sorry

[33] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 23.
[34] Ibid., p. 25.
[35] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 25.

. . . my sore throat increased and with it my satisfaction . . . next day I . . . let blood . . . and . . . recovered.'[36] Then comes the honest statement: 'my reason told me I was in no danger, and only melancholy flattered me with which I wisht so much as death, which was I ashamed to own.'[37]

Some significant references to the Queen were made in the debates in Parliament on the Regency Bill at the end of April. The regal power had been vested in the King and Queen, but the exercise of it in the King alone. The problem before the house was legally 'to let the Queen into some of that regal power now in the King.' There was a unanimous decision on the part of the Judges that this could not be done but by an Act of Parliament. References were made in the lower House to those who in earlier times had been 'Custodes Regni'; in every case, there had been a delegation of authority to one who did not originally possess or share it, but there was no precedent which fitted the case at issue. Though there could not be two sovereign powers, however, 'there may be one sovereign power in two persons.'[38] 'Whensoever . . . it shall happen that His . . . Majesty shall be out of this realm of England, the regal power and government . . . be administered and exercised by the Queen's most excellent Majesty in the names of both their Majesties during only such His said Majesty's absence out of this realm of England.'[39] The exigencies of the political situation determined the legislators, for 'there must not be a defect in the administration during the King's absence.'[40] Much time was spent in anticipating the practical difficulties that might arise as a result of the Queen's sharing in

[36] Ibid., pp. 26 f. [37] Ibid., p. 27. [38] House of Lords MSS, 1690, p. 35.
[39] 2. William and Mary 1. c., 6. [40] Cobbett, p. 617.

the exercise of regal power. If the King and Queen issued different commands, what was to be obeyed? Justice Eyre gave his opinion that the Act 'constitutes the power in the Queen, but it is but temporary . . . I take it that the latter command is to be obeyed . . . This might be inconvenient, were it not *sweetened in the person in whom it is settled.*'[41] The following extracts from the speeches in the Lower House may be given as illustrative of the popularity of the Queen.

Serjeant Maynard. This noble lady, the Queen, has so demeaned herself that there is not one man nor woman but will trust her.

Mr. Harcourt. The King has chosen the Queen for the administration . . . in his absence. I am not for putting her under guardianship, nor for putting her under Council. She may sway the sceptre, and I know not why she should not have the power.

Mr. Somers. I believe her the best woman in the world, and she has showed herself so ever since she came hither.

Sir. H. Goodrick. There is nothing left but that immediate way with the Queen, and I would acquiesce in that. I do it as to an English Princess; we may place our trust in her.[42]

The Regency Bill was passed on the 9th May, and received royal assent on the 20th.

William early gave Mary the names of those who were to assist her. He named Lord Shrewsbury as one who might be trusted entirely, and 'spoke of him with so much kindness that I was extreamly surprised to find, that upon a dispute he had had with Lord President before the King, in which the King

[41] House of Lords MSS, 1690, p. 35. [42] Cobbett, pp. 617, 633.

followed Lord President's advice before his, he would quit his place . . . This surprised me extreamly, and gave me a very melancholy prospect of things.'[43] Mary regarded the nine statesmen who were to form her cabinet with a penetrating scrutiny, and recorded in her Memoirs her verdict. The Great Council was of 'a strange composition,' the cabinet council 'not much better.'[44] Danby, the Lord President, was of a temper 'I can never like.' The Whig, Devonshire, Steward of the Household, 'might be trusted and must be complimented, but he I found weack and obstinate,—a meer tool of a party.' Dorset, the Lord Chamberlain, was 'too lazy to give himself the trouble of bussiness, so was of little use.' Lord Pembroke was 'as mad as most of his family, though very good-natured, and a man of honour—but not very steady as I found in the bussiness of Lord Torrington.' Mary states that the Tory, Nottingham, was suspected by most of infidelity to the government: 'None would trust or have anything to do with him, though in the post he was, he must do all. The King believed him an honest man, but he was thought too violent for his party . . . Lord Monmouth is mad, and his wife, who is madder, governs him . . . I will say nothing of Lord Marlborough, because t'is he I could say the most of . . . can never deserve either trust or esteem.' Sir John Lowther was 'a very honest but weack man . . . chief of the Treasury . . . Mr. Russell was most recommended to me for sincerity, yet he had his faults. . . This was the Council I was to follow in all things.'[45]

[43] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 28. Lord Shrewsbury had been Secretary of State: his resignation on the eve of the King's departure left Lord Nottingham as sole Secretary.

[44] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 29. [45] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, pp. 29 f.

CHAPTER THREE

THE SUMMER OF 1690

'JE PLAINS le povre Reine qui est en des terribles afflictions,'[1] wrote William in the early part of 1690, to Portland who was away in Holland. The King had given Mary some indication of what was to be feared by asking her a question which was also put to her later by the Lord President of the Council: in the case of any rising or disturbance in the city, what would she do? Her answer was characteristic: 'I cannot tell how much frightened I may be, but I promise not to be governed by my own or other's fears. I will follow the advice of those who I believe have most courage and judgment.' She resolved secretly that, let what would happen, she would never go from Whitehall. She prepared herself 'for the worst,' and believed that, when the King went, they would never meet again. She felt that there was nothing for her to trust to 'humanly speacking' when the King was gone.

Mary could hardly have been given the task of controlling affairs at a more critical time. There was grave reason to doubt the loyalty of some of those occupying important offices of state; there were many 'disaffected ones' who were ready to take advantage of any opportunity that offered for recalling the late King; and the country was almost denuded of troops. 'I believe never any person was left in greater streights of all kinds . . . If any rising had happend upon the apeering of the French fleet . . . I had been in a very bad condition.'[2]

The Queen was undoubtedly aware of the existence of a

[1] Brit. Mus. Add. 34514, vol. 28, f. 60. [2] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 31.

widespread and well-organized Jacobite conspiracy. Early in January, 1690, information reached the King that an invitation was soon to be sent to King James, and an attempt was made to prevent the letter's getting to France, but without success. In proof that William discussed with his wife current events may be instanced his acquainting her with the arrival of Fuller, a spy who had come to England bearing letters from Mary of Modena. The King and Fuller were intent upon the contents of an earthen vessel over the fire, and the room was 'full of a great steam and a noisome smell,' when the Queen entered. The letters from France were 'writ obscurely'[3] and needed treatment before becoming legible. Mary expressed satisfaction at the services rendered by the spy, and demanded who was the author of the invention, which she much admired.

Soon it was made clear to the King and Queen that Scots as well as English were in conspiracy. In May, William's private secretary, Carstares, received a communication from his brother-in-law, William Dunlop, a Presbyterian minister in Scotland, which he answered on the 14th. His Majesty desired to know further particulars of the 'business of moment . . . He is willing to give a full indemnity to particular persons, but is not as yet so clear as to a general one.'[4] From another source we learn that a certain Scots lord began in May to feel the pangs of an uneasy conscience. He sent for 'one Mr. Dunlop, a fanatick minister,' and desired prayers that he might open his heart. After his first appeal through Dunlop and Carstares, Lord Ross tried to gain audience of the King, but the latter, who had just left London for Ireland, advised him to go to Whitehall to make what terms he could with the Queen.

[3] Life of Fuller, p. 52. [4] Life of William Carstares, Story, p. 181.

It is obvious that the safety of England in this crisis depended upon the adequacy of its naval defence, yet after the Revolution the administration of the English navy was in a state of chaos. Defective organization, widespread corruption, and lack of money made difficulties that seemed for a time insuperable.[5] In December, 1689, Herbert, Lord Torrington, a seaman of experience, tried to avoid responsibility for any subsequent naval disaster by resigning his office as First Lord of the Admiralty, his attempts to make the navy more efficient having been defeated by the four other members of the Board, who were civilians and therefore without practical knowledge of naval affairs. His successor was Lord Pembroke, an able and honest nobleman of no great capacity. Torrington retained the command of the fleet, and vainly urged Pembroke and the government to make adequate preparation. Admiral Russell, a member of Mary's cabinet council, had appealed to the Secretary of State, Lord Nottingham, in January, 1690, to give serious consideration to the state of the fleet.[6] The seamen were conscious

[5] The estimated annual expenditure for the year 1689, £4,600,000, was in excess of estimated receipts by £1,770,000, and there were no funds to cover this deficit. The expense of the navy for one year was estimated in April, 1689, to be about £1,229,000. Whatever may have been the share of available funds devoted to the navy, there is evidence that the supplies of food, clothing and munitions for both army and navy were inadequate. The Victuallers of the Navy could not get delivery of all the provisions that were to be shipped with certain regiments in November, 1689, because they had not the money to pay for them (C. S. P. Dom. 1689-90, p. 330). In a letter written in October of that year is the sentence: "The winter will prove fatal to our poor men, they having scarcely clothes enough to cover their nakedness" (Ibid., p. 291). In the following spring, Shrewsbury wrote to the Mayor of London, asking him to persuade 'the Jews of London' to increase the loan they had promised, to provide bread for the army, from £12,000 to £30,000, 'or at least £20,000' (ibid., p. 453).

[6] 'For Godsake, My Lord, cast your eye sometimes towards the next summer's fleet. I dread the French being out before us . . . I see all matters relating to the navy goe on soe slowly that I am in amaze . . . ' (Hist. MSS Comm., Finch II. 269f.).

of dangers of which the politicians seemed to be unaware. When William left for Ireland on the 4th June, the fleet, English and Dutch, was but slowly assembling in the Downs.

To the lack of military protection, the presence of Jacobitism, and the possibility of inadequate naval defence must be added the fact that Queen Mary had grave reasons to doubt the honour of some of the statesmen with whom she was to be in daily contact, and upon whose advice she would have to depend. Her knowledge of this must have made more bitter her consciousness of her own inefficiency and inexperience. During this time she must also have been filled by a fearful apprehension of what might result from the conflict in Ireland. The work of the Revolution Settlement might be undone by a defeat of William's army, and father and husband might meet in mortal combat. Yet she must be cheerful, self-possessed, resourceful, and courageous as she walked about the old Palace at Whitehall, appearing before the gaze of many who were very curious concerning the mind of a Queen in so remarkable a situation. She must be wary in accepting too easily the truth of any statement made to her on public affairs, no matter from whose lips. Not one of those astute, facile, over-polite lords, who surrounded her with their sometimes half-mocking subservience, must get from her any hastily uttered words that might be construed to the disadvantage of her country and William's Great Cause. When she sat with the nine who formed her cabinet, or presided at meetings of the Privy Council, she must lose no words that pass, and she must watch the faces of her advisers for fleeting expressions significant of emotions which would help her in her difficult task of getting to know the truth and of acting upon it. Then she must show herself in the city and

reveal no trace of the gloom and foreboding that filled her heart to the crowd, respectful but curious, of artisans, apprentices, merchants, and others, who watched the progress of the royal carriage. What thoughts would naturally come to the minds of this average London crowd, as they greeted the gracious and smiling woman of whom little was known but her piety and beauty? Did they remember that great Queen who passed often through the streets a hundred years ago? Was a Queen to bring once more to England stability and peace? Elizabeth was only a woman, but under her England defeated the mighty naval power of Spain, and made safe the doctrines of the reformed faith. The streets echoed with loud cheers for the new Queen. A hundred years ago England sent help to the struggling Protestants of the Netherlands. Now she had given a share of regal power to one who came from there as the husband of her Queen. But there were mutterings in the crowd; there were those who gazed without enthusiasm at the passing figure. England once had a Queen who was a Queen but for a few days, and then went, without guilt, to the scaffold. Was Mary to be a second Elizabeth, or another Lady Jane Grey?—It is certain that she was fully conscious of the difficulties and dangers of her position.

For nearly three weeks after William's departure Mary gave herself to the routine of business. In this time she learnt much, not only of personalities, but of the technical details of administration. No event of great importance occurred until late on the evening of Sunday, the 22nd June, when the Secretary-of-State, Lord Nottingham, brought to her the intimation that the French fleet had appeared that day on the coast. She revealed no fear as she discussed with him methods of preserving

internal peace and the integrity of the land from the menace of foreign invasion. After his departure she wrote the disastrous news to William: 'Methinks Lord Torrington has made no haste . . . I thank God I am not much afraid; I think too little, which makes me fear 'tis want of apprehending the danger . . . That which troubles me most is your absence, and the fear I am in that something may be done to hinder us from hearing from you.'[7] The possibility of communication being cut between England and Ireland was indeed a serious one.

Two days later a letter from Torrington giving particulars of the great numerical superiority of the French fleet was placed before the Queen. What her thoughts were on reading the stern sentences of the commander of the navy with their note of accusation may best be imagined. 'The odds are great, and you know it is not my fault. To-morrow probably will be the desiding day: lett them tremble at the consequence whose fault it was that the fleet is noe stronger; for my part, I will, by God Almightie's help, doe my duty, and I hope everybody here will doe soe too.'[8] Later in the day, Mary sent the ominous news to William: 'I cannot but be in pain . . . I fear besides the disheartening many people, the loss of a battle would be such an encouragement to disaffected ones that might put things here in a disorder which in your absence would be a terrible thing.'[9] Before she had finished this letter, she was 'called out' by Lord Nottingham, who had brought her a letter from the King which was 'so welcome that I cannot express it, especially because you pity me, which I like and desire from you and you only . . . It is now candlelight and I dare say no more.'[10]

[7] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. 2, p. 118.
[8] Hist. MSS Comm., Finch II, 308.
[9] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. 2, pp. 119 f. [10] Ibid.

On the 23rd June, Lord Ross, a 'disaffected one,' informed Melvill, then Lord High Commissioner, that there had been 'thes dayes past' great reports in Edinburgh of plots against the government, and he was in fear lest he should be incriminated: 'having all my life been used to the fields, I am aprehensive a close prison might soon end my days.' He therefore deemed it desirable to 'retire to Ingland' to answer objections against him. Melvill gave him a letter to present to the Queen upon arrival in London, and during the next week, while Mary and her councillors were anxiously awaiting news of the impending naval conflict, the Scots lord was making the slow and fatiguing journey southward. In the meantime, Mary had to deal with 'disaffected ones' in London; internal rebellion at such a time would be calamitous. Proclamations had already been issued against Papists, and the necessity of imprisoning suspected Jacobites was discussed at a meeting of the Privy Council on Tuesday, the 24th June, the day on which Torrington's letter caused such consternation in the heart of the Queen. When one of the councillors suggested the name of Lord Clarendon, there there was a dead silence. Clarendon, the uncle of the Queen! Mary regarded for a moment the embarrassed faces of the assembled lords, and then spoke decisively: she had seen Clarendon's incriminating letter, and was really concerned at the knowledge of his disloyalty; if the Council thought that the exigencies of affairs warranted it, Clarendon should be 'clapt up.'[11]

Wednesday passed without any news from the fleet. The sickness of suspense was then being experienced by the Queen.

[11] Mary wrote in her Memoirs about Clarendon's intercepted letter: 'It was more certainly known by a letter I had by me of his . . . I was really concerned at the knowledge of it' (Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 25).

On Thursday the Cabinet Council met, and the Duke of Devonshire, suspicious of Torrington's apparent refusal to meet the enemy, proposed joining someone in commission with him. This idea was not approved by the other members of the Council, and similar propositions made during the day by the anxious and perturbed councillors were wisely negatived by the Queen, on the excuse that it was 'not proper' to send away any of the nine. Mary saw clearly that disinterested zeal for the safety of England was not the only passion that impelled the various members of her oddly constituted cabinet to propose one another for the work of assisting or superceding Torrington: party animosity and personal dislike often operated in the hearts of these statesmen.

On the next day, the 27th, Lord Carmarthen was in audience with the Queen, when Nottingham entered, bearing a letter from Torrington, the perusal of which caused anger and deep dismay. He reported that on the 25th he had tried to bring on a battle, but that the French had refused to fight. The revelation that Torrington then had of the enemy's great strength caused him to desire to avoid conflict. His council of war unanimously agreed that they would try to pass the French to the eastward in order to join the two separate squadrons which were at sea under Killigrew and Shovell, for which annihilation was to be feared in the event of the defeat of the main fleet. If this proved to be impossible, they would retire to the Gunfleet. Torrington considered that a fight would not only ruin the fleet, but 'the quiet of the country, too, for they, being masters of the sea, could do many things . . . Had I been beleeved in winter, the Kingdom had not received this insult . . .

I desire you to assure her Majesty that whatsoever she commands shall be done, be the consequences what it will.'[12]

At the cabinet meeting which was held forthwith it was decided immediately to send to Torrington the Queen's orders: 'Her Majesty thinks the consequences of his withdrawing to the Gunfleet would be so fatal that she rather chooses he should . . . give battle to the enemy . . . He is by no means to lose sight of the French fleet, whereby they may have opportunities of makeing attempts upon the shore, or in the rivers of Medway or Thames, or gett away without fighting.'[13] The politicians, full of a preconceived hostility towards and distrust of Torrington, and perturbed by the imminence of danger, were not able properly to appreciate the logic of his arguments. To maintain the existence of the English fleet unimpaired was his great object: an intact defending fleet can nearly always prevent territorial attack.

The lords remained in Nottingham's office after the Queen had left the cabinet meeting. Very wearily she had retired for the night, when Nottingham asked for an audience. He told her that Monmouth, one of the cabinet councillors, begged that the Admiralty might give him a captain's commission, so that he might fit out the best ship at Portsmouth and join Torrington, swearing that 'he will not come back if they do not fight.' The lords present, who comprised two-thirds of the cabinet, approved of this, and the Queen did not feel able to refuse her consent. Her comment on the incident to William was: 'He may be the best spared of the company.'[14]

[12] Hist. MSS Comm., Finch II. 316. [13] Hist. MSS Comm., Finch II. 318.
[14] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. 2, p. 124.

On the next day, Saturday, Mary was up at eight o'clock writing an account of the events of the preceding day to William. She was summoned to a meeting of the cabinet, and was not able to finish her letter until ten o'clock at night. In the interval she had received a letter from him. 'I cannot express what I feel at the thoughts that now it may be you are ready to give battle or have done it. My heart is ready to burst. I can say nothing but pray to God for you. This . . . almost puts me out of any possibility of saying any more, yet I must strive with my heart to tell you that this afternoon the ill news of the battle of Fleury came . . . I can say nothing but that God in whose hands all events are, knows best . . . I must end my letter for my eyes are at present in somewhat a worse condition than before I received your letter. I trust in God who alone cann preserve you and comfort me.'[15]

Comfort indeed was needed. A defeat of the armies facing Louis XIV—William's warning of the imminence of a decisive combat between himself and King James in Ireland—the grave possibility of a defeat of the English navy, which would make likely a French invasion—such were the facts of the situation with which the Queen had to grapple.

Yet no doubt she received into her presence with dignity and composure the Solicitor for Scotland, Sir William Lockhart, who on that day carried to the Queen a letter from Lord Melvill: 'Sir William Lockhart will acquaint your Majesty with some designs that are on foot . . . The Lord Rosse, who was one concerned, has given me some account, and has promised to wait on your Majesty and to acquaint you with all he knows . . . Your Majesty is wise enough to know how to manage him.

[15] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. 2, p. 125.

I have sent some queries . . . to put to him.'[16] That evening the Queen's secretary, D'Alone, brought Lord Ross up 'the bake staires to the eating-rome,' and the man of the fields found himself in the presence of the royal lady whose father he had been intriguing to place again upon the throne. The incoherence of his confession, of which the Queen's record is extant, was not due entirely to his duplicity, but probably also in part to a certain natural embarrassment.

After formal preliminaries, Ross ventured to make conditions: he desired that his confession should not be used as evidence, and 'that none may know that I have spoken with your Majesty.'

'If I find you deal with me as you promised, I will give you my word that you shall be no further known in it that you wish yourself,' was the Queen's reply.

The Scotsman hesitated. Then he tried to persuade the Queen first to receive him formally in her chamber at 'some publike hour,' but she sternly requested him to proceed at once with his story. He betrayed confusion, but at length, seeing that the Queen was inexorable, made a rambling statement incriminating himself and two other Scotch noblemen: 'thay received a letter from the late King from St. Germains of which none but thay three knew . . . Sir James was the contriver of all . . . Lord Annandale was at the Bath . . . As for persons heer, he coud name none but Ferguson . . . There was a riseing intended heer for which severall officers wear gone into theire severall contres . . . He remembered none of their names but Oglethorp . . . The French thought themselves

[16] Leven and Melvill Papers, p. 449.

sure of 12 sea captains but he knew not theire names.'[17] Ross further informed the Queen that he had a friend in town, 'a Scots man' who knew everything 'very perfectly' and 'all names of persons concerned . . . He was acquainted with the whole bussiness both there and heer,' and if her Majesty would promise the same favour to his friend as to himself, he would bring him to her on Sunday or Monday. 'By that time, he hoped to speake with Fergesson who was then out of town and who could tell him a great deall, but that as yet he [Ross] had not stired out of his lodging since he came for fear I shoud have sent for him in the meantime—(that I knew to be fals)'—so ended Mary's report of the interview. Before Ross withdrew, he promised to answer in writing other questions that her Majesty would later put to him.

On Sunday further consultations were held at Whitehall. No news of the sea battle had been received. Some of the councillors suggested that Torrington might even refuse to obey the Queen's instructions. They proposed that Admiral Russell should be sent to Dover immediately and 'in case the Earl of Torrington should come in sight with our fleet' to send him up to London in custody. The Admiral on Sunday evening started for Dover to take upon himself the command of the fleet. On Monday morning the following letter was received from Torrington: 'Off Beechi: I this minute receive Her Majesty's orders, which I will, soe soon as I can get the Flag officers on board, communicate to them. I am very certayne that they all will with myself with great cherefulnesse give due obedience to her comands . . . Had we Killigrew with us the match would have been a little more equal . . . Whilst we

[17] Ibid., p. 485.

observe the French, they cannot make any attempt eyther upon ships or shore without running a great hazard,[18] and if we are beaten, all is exposed to theyr mercy. 'Tis very possible I reason wrong, but I doe assure you I can and will obey. Pray God direct all for the best.'[19] Russell was ordered to return to London on the day that Torrington was facing at dawn a new and untried foe, commanded by the most able French admiral of the age.

Those were days fraught with great peril for the English nation. During that Sunday and Monday the Queen and her advisers were full of the most grave apprehensions as to the probable result of the conflict that was being waged. Early on Tuesday, before the news of the defeat had reached her, the Queen granted a second interview to Ross, in which, although she displayed both strength and dexterity, she failed to get much information of value. To her amazement he retracted his previous statements and tried to persuade her that all papers had been burnt, and that Ferguson was innocent of the 'main matter.' When she asked him if he had seen his friend, the Scotsman, his reply was 'No, he is out of town, but he knows nothing, so 'tis no matter.' The Queen was at a loss to account for this change. She did not know that 'the correspondents and intimates' of Ross had persuaded him that the matter was to be so managed 'that the plott should be stiffled and not fully enquired into.'[20] Before dismissing Ross, however, the Queen produced the paper of queries, and when

[18] Torrington's doctrine of the 'fleet in being' constitutes the chief interest of the Battle of Beachy Head from the point of view of naval strategy.

[19] Hist. MSS Comm., Finch II, p. 323.

[20] 'Observations on a Report of Sir James Montgomery to James VII on the state of political parties circa 1693,' printed in The Melvills and the Leslies, by Sir William Fraser, III. 236.

he proposed to answer them orally, reminded him ' 'Twas your own desire, my Lord, you promised to answer in writing.'

'I am unwilling that my hand should be seen, for 'twould be making me an evidence.'

Mary quickly rejoined, ' 'Twill not be seen by anyone but me,' and even in the face of further entreaty, she refused to allow him to depart from his pledge. Reluctantly he took the questions, and agreed 'to read them over.'

Late on that day, the 1st July, news of the disaster reached London. At seven o'clock in the morning of the 2nd July, Mary was busily writing a report of it to William: 'Torrington will never be forgiven here . . . he was the only man there had no mind to fight . . . I am more concerned for the honour of the nation than for anything else.'[21]

The numerical inferiority of the English was such that, while their line of ships covered a distance of a little over four miles, the French fleet stretched for six miles across the waters of the channel. After the battle Torrington, hoping to elude the pursuit of the enemy, retired to the eastward, with his disabled ships in tow. The Dutch, who had been placed in the van, had been in close action with the rear part of the French van, and were badly damaged. In Torrington's account of the defeat he made particular reference to the courage of the Dutch, and said that he intended if possible to retire into the river and there make what defence he could if the French pursued. 'Had I been left to my liberty, I had prevented any attempt upon the land . . . had I undertaken this of my own head, I should

[21] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. 2, p. 126.

not well know what to say: but its being done by command will, I hope, free me from blame.'[22]

The Lords unanimously agreed to send two of their number at once to the fleet. The Queen found it difficult to name the two most suitable, and asked for suggestions from the board. After some discussion Carmarthen proposed that he should go. The Queen's immediate rejoinder was that he could not be spared; at this he seemed 'ill-satisfied.' Mary, with her unfailing tact, afterwards drew him aside and bade him remember how necessary he was. He replied that he did not look upon himself as so tied that he might not go away upon occasions. Mary then urged that, even if he were not so tied 'by place,' yet as he was the one whose advice William had most strongly recommended to her, she could not spare him. In the end, Mary chose Devonshire and Pembroke—'these seemed the most proper to me upon what I had heard them say and the manner they said it.'[23] The two noblemen were sent to the fleet on the 3rd, with instructions to summon a council of war, at which they were to tell the officers, both English and Dutch, 'how much the Queen depends upon their courage and fidelity.' Torrington was to return at once to London. At a meeting of the Privy Council, on the 9th July, at which Mary was present,

[22] Ibid., pp. 112 f. The bitter anger and resentment felt by Nottingham against Torrington is disclosed in a letter which he wrote to William on the 3rd July: 'In plain terms, My Lord Torrington deserted the Dutch so shamefully that the whole squadron had been lost if some of our ships had not rescued them . . . I find that it is believed by all men that we should have ruined that fleet which is now pursuing us, if My Lord Torrington had done his duty . . . the whole fleet is in danger of being destroyed, especially if this man remains in command of it' (Hist. MSS Comm., Finch II. 334). Admiral Mahan gives the number of the French as seventy and that of the allies as fifty-six or sixty. He also says that the English admiral 'failed to attack vigorously' (*Influence of Sea Power*, p. 182).

[23] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. 2, p. 127.

it was decided to apprehend him 'for certain high crimes and misdemeanours,' which were later defined as 'keeping back and not engaging and coming into the fight, and not relieving and assisting a known friend in view.'[24]

Torrington's trial did not take place until the beginning of December. Of the thirty-six naval officers who gave evidence on oath, only seven or eight imputed any blame to him, and the verdict of this legally constituted tribunal was the acquittal of the accused. William, however, did not avail himself further of the services of Torrington; the latter, therefore, retired at a time when the nation was in dire need of the loyal labours of all men of ripe experience.

The tragedy of Beachy Head resulted not from the cowardice and incompetence of Torrington, but from the administrative chaos which followed the Revolution and to the ignorance and incapacity of the civilian politicians who controlled the policy of the cabinet. It were futile to conjecture whether William, if he had been in England, would have taken a different course from that followed by the Queen in ordering Torrington to fight, but there is no reason to attribute responsibility for the defeat to her. In the defence which Torrington made occurs the passage: 'that our fighting upon so great a disadvantage as we did was of the last consequence to the kingdom is as certain as that the Queen could not have been prevailed with to sign an order for it, had not both our weakness and the strength of the enemy been disguised to her.'[25]

In London and the provinces a state of almost wild panic existed for some weeks. On the 2nd July instructions were sent

[24] Hist. MSS Comm., Finch II. 385. [25] Naval Warfare, by Colomb, p. 122.

by 'Her Majesty's express commands,' to the Lords Lieutenants to raise the militia in their respective counties, and on the 15th to keep them prepared for action for a month. On the 18th a proclamation was issued postponing the circuits of the Justices, and seven days later the Privy Council ordered that all oxen and cattle should be driven twenty miles from the shore in the South, 'in case the French should land.' The ordinary mails passing into Scotland were stopped, and a strict watch was kept for disaffected persons on the borders. Mary attended all the meetings of the Privy Council at which these matters were discussed; she therefore had full knowledge of the dangers that were imminent.

Newsletters of the time also afford evidence of the state of public feeling. On the 26th June the Queen was reported to be 'extremely vigorous and cheerful under these great weights of government.'[26] On the 8th July 'several regiments of horse and foot are marched towards the seacoast of Sussex and Kent . . . this day came out a proclamation for all seamen to repair to their Majesties' fleets and service.' Ten days later it was announced that 'the Lord Mayor had been a third time with the Queen, who signified to him that she certainly believed that the French would make a descent upon us since . . . they were bringing off a great many men to Dunkirk, shipping off others at St. Malo and elsewhere, and she there ordered his Lordship to get on foot all the forces they could both of trained bands and auxiliaries and appear with them on Monday in Hyde Park.' On the 21st 'the six city regiments marched into Hyde Park composed of between 9000 and 10,000 men. Her Majesty viewed them in her coach, and gave them thanks for their readiness to serve her.'

[26] Hist. MSS Comm., Le Fleming MSS, p. 275.

Lord Ross had agreed with some reluctance to read over the questions which Mary wished him to answer. A day or so later, in the midst of the consternation caused by the naval defeat, he again presented himself before the Queen,—'he brought me the queries bake and the ansers he gave I have write down.' The paper in the Queen's handwriting begins thus: 'He is very sory he cannot ansere all these questions—frivolous excuses!'

It is not difficult to recreate in imagination the scene as the Queen read aloud each question and wrote down the answers she had to force from the unwilling lips of the Scotsman. 'How and upon what occasion was this design laid, and when begun?—what were the methods by which it was carried on?—who were the chief actors and contrivers?—to whom was it communicated in England and Scotland?—how far is it gone and what expectations have you in carrying it further?' The only reply was: 'None knew of it but the three commissioners.' Then came the question: 'As to that part of the Presbyterian party which is joined with the Cavalier party, when and upon what terms was that union made? What terms were demanded by them of the late King or Queen, and what terms were offered by him or her to them?' Ross replied that the section of the Presbyterian party joined with the Cavaliers 'because the others could not agree.' 'Their design he believes and bids me not doubt was to bring in the late King again; but upon his refusing to quite his popish officers both in the army and government, they burnt all their papers . . . He says upon his honour and the word of a gentleman over and over that he knows no more . . . he never liked the thing; and so kept much in the contre . . . many compliments . . . if all go well at sea, no

danger, but if the French could land, or else.'[27] Her pen refused to follow her thoughts further: the final words are significant of the fear with which her mind was obsessed; she had not yet heard of the victory of the Boyne.

What the Queen thought of the conspirator and his confession may be seen from a letter she wrote on the 3rd to Lord Melvill: 'I received your letter . . . as also the other by the scrupulouse person whom I have seen . . . to very little purpose. He has made me promise he shall be no evidence, and has taken care to make me keep my word, for he has named no person, nor told nothing but what was known heer before . . . I confess I cannot be so aprehensive of the dangers. God has of his goodness revealed enough to make us stand upon our garde . . . You may be assured I will help you all I can from hence.'[28]

Mary a few days later granted at his own request another interview to Lord Ross, and was then informed that his wife was dying and his presence was urgently needed in Scotland. The Queen had previously conferred with Carmarthen and Sir William Lockhart; they had both 'gessed the bussiness, and desired he might by no means be lett go,' so her response to the Scotsman was: 'I do not think you have kept your word to me, which I take for a discharge of mine. You must stay in London until you hear further from me.' On the 9th July a warrant was signed for his commitment to the Tower, and Mary noticed that certain members of the Privy Council refused to sign it.

Two significant letters reached London from Melvill during this time. In one to the Queen, he expressed the opinion that 'the safety of the government seems to require that there should

[27] Leven and Melvill Papers, pp. 453 f. [28] Ibid., p. 459.

be an evidence to the world of the truth of the conspiracy . . . Sir James Montgomery . . . a chife manager in it hath . . . been twice with me, and confessed his concern in that matter, offering his service to defeat it . . . and he desires to wait on your Majesty . . . I find by him that some eminent persons in England are concerned, whom he is unwilling to name . . . Some of them are in chife employment.' This was followed by a letter to the Queen's secretary, D'Alone, in which Melvill complains of the almost unbroken silence: 'All intelligence cutt off; not hearing from the Queen; the King at such a distance . . . traitors in our bosom . . . I should be glad to have the Queen's commands . . . I pray God preserve and direct her Majestie.'[29] A letter was forthwith dispatched to Scotland, desiring Montgomery to wait upon the Queen and promising pardon after a frank and full confession. But Montgomery delayed obedience to the royal command.

Lord Ross had told Mary that the third conspirator, Annandale, was at 'the Bath,' and a messenger was sent there on the 10th July, but he could not be found. Lady Annandale then negotiated terms of surrender with Sir William Lockhart, and it was agreed that her husband should make his discovery in writing, and that he should not hold converse with anyone in relation 'to the cryms.'[30] Annandale surrendered himself on the 12th August, and the Queen received him at 8 o'clock in the evening. Sir William Lockhart was present and assisted in the examination.

Annandale was first made aware of the conspiracy by Montgomery, suggesting that they should apply to James II for

[29] Leven and Melvill Papers, p. 467.

[30] 'The Queen was verie willing he should be remited on thir terms'—Sir W. Lockhart to Melvill, Aug. 13 (ibid., p. 491).

employment. Annandale agreed and Ross afterwards joined in the scheme. Several meetings took place in the Fleet prison, London, in the rooms of Nevil Payne, a Jacobite agent, at which plans for the restoration of the late King matured.[31] The last meeting was held at the house of one Williamson, near Hyde Park, and there the letter to James was signed which was to be carried to Ireland via France. The basis of the project was that James should be recalled by vote of the Scotch Parliament, which was to sit in May, 1690. Montgomery's scheme for securing the necessary majority was foiled by the concessions that Melvill then made to the extreme Whigs; the committee of the Lords of the Articles was abolished, and Presbyterianism was to be recognised by the state. Then James' answer was received in Edinburgh: a large bag containing many papers, commissions, letters, and a general indemnity was handed to Sir James Montgomery. After the contents had been examined by the conspirators in Lord Arran's room in Holyroodhouse, they were burnt by Montgomery and Annandale in the chamber of Lord Breadalbane. Annandale went into the country and Lord Ross appeased his conscience by making confession. This account of the conspiracy was written down by Sir William Lockhart at the Earl's dictation, and 'delivered be the Earle to the Queen's most excellent Majestie, the 14th day of August, 1690.' Annandale's care not to implicate the English conspirators is obvious. Would Montgomery show less scruple when he came face to face with the Queen?

In the meantime, Melvill was engaging that Montgomery should not be used as a witness if he dealt 'freely and ingenu-

[31] 'Paine had several rooms in the Fleet and great company came to him, and he was suspected to hold great correspondency, for he writes very much and gives great entertainment' (House of Lords MSS, 1689-90, p. 4).

ously' with the Queen, and then dispatched the man with his pass and a letter to her Majesty.

A letter which Mary received from Melvill some days afterwards contains significant phrases: 'No question your Majesty knows there has been a double design carrying on . . . One great scruple he has is that some who may have been concerned . . . may prejudge him at your Majesty's hand, lest they should be discovered by your Majesty, and what their part hath been. Your Majesty is wise enough to know what is your own interest in this: it would be my humble opinion, and it is my desire, that you should keep this from all till the King come, and make your own use of it. There never was greater dissimulation and villainy since the world began than has been in this time . . . He has sent me two papers signed by the late King, and also two letters written with the late Queen's hand.'[32] Twice more did Melvill appeal to Mary not to allow herself to be prejudiced by influence at court: 'Your Majesty may gain, cannot lose, by hearing all; you know how to make your own use of things; and . . . if you were to keep things close with yourself, until you be at the bottom of all, you can have no prejudice; it would encourage to the more freedom.'[33]

Sir James Montgomery arrived in London on the 8th or 9th August, and at once sent to Annandale stating that he had forged a pass to reach London for the purpose of getting a letter over to James II. He urged Annandale not to make any confession. The Queen knew on the 10th of this message, but a search was not made for Montgomery until the 17th, and in the interval she received Annandale's statement. Then Montgomery's wife asked audience of the Queen, and Lockhart re-

[32] Leven and Melvill Papers, p. 481. [33] Ibid., p. 483.

ported this interview to Melvill thus: 'She pretends the reason he is not comed in is because he wanted a letter from your grace to the Queen; such shams won't go with her Majestie . . . the Queen hath told the lady that she will enter into no treatie; but if he render himselfe, he shall be secur as to his lyf.'[34] Lady Montgomery then sought the presence of Lady Annandale, and gave vent to her wrath: 'givs my Lady all the ill nams you can fancie, treats my Lord as a rogue who had . . . discovered things he ought not, and betrayed her husband.'[35]

It was not until the 6th September that Montgomery, 'a little thin man, about forty years of age, wearing a brown periwig,'[36] presented himself before the Queen. An account of the interview in Mary's handwriting is extant. She began by saying that she understood that he had come to tell her 'several things, which, though by your delay, I have had other ways of knowing, yet I am come to hear what you have to say, and I can assure you that I am a very good judge as to whether you deal sincerely or no.' Sir John pleaded illness as the cause of delay. 'He still talked as if he had a mind to evade the whole thing,' and said that he had enemies who had endeavoured to misrepresent him. Mary speedily cut short his remarks: 'All this is nothing to the purpose; tell me what you have to say; that will be your best way.' She assured him that his information should not be divulged to anyone, but 'that the Commissioner and Lord Monmouth knew.' Montgomery then acknowledged that James II had written to him offering to land 10,000 men into Scotland by the 1st March, but that he had replied that money should be sent instead, for any landing of

[34] Ibid., p. 517. [35] Ibid., p. 499 f. [36] So reads a contemporary description.

French or Irish would unite all people against the late King. The Scots Lord then asked Mary to refresh his memory, and would 'feign have made me speak.' He assured her that her administration had done much good; she was 'more afable than the King, who was more reserved and so had not gained so many.' Mary ignored this, and pressed for the names of others involved. He then mentioned several Scottish lords. 'Is that all you have to say?' 'Yes, all that related to Scotland; and about England, I know nothing.' 'I do!' Mary observed. 'I believe that is possible,' was his reply; 'all that I know is that one message was sent to the Bishop of Ely and Lord Griffin.' 'Lord Melvill thinks you know a great deal, but will not name persons.' After much hesitation, he named Marlborough and Godolphin, but 'did not believe it.'

He made many protestations and desired that the Queen would accept of his zeal and his service; he wished to owe all to her and hoped she would believe him. Her reply was characteristic: 'It is in your power hereafter to show the truth of your words by your actions, and that requires time for the triall. You must not wonder, therefore, if I wait for that, after what you have done.' He begged her to tell him how he stood with her, and if she thought him sincere. Her answer was simply that he had been reserved—'He was troubled at that.'[37]

Mary's reference to Monmouth in her conversation with Montgomery was obviously meant to draw from Sir James a disclosure regarding the English conspirators. The share which

[37] Leven and Melvill Papers, p. 525. On the 7th, Lockhart reported this interview to Melvill: 'I have had no particular account, but that he conceals most things, especially in relation to England, and urged the Queen to ask him questions of purpose to know wher she pointed, that she might understand what she knew.'

Englishmen took in this plot has never been fully revealed; indeed the complete story of their activities was probably never recorded, and the evidence against them is therefore scattered and fragmentary, but there are many indications that officials in high places are involved.[38] The Queen certainly had grave reason to fear Monmouth's disloyalty; in her astute criticisms of the members of her cabinet is the following remark concerning him: 'I knew him greatly engaged in Scotland and not much to be trusted, yet must know all.'[39] Burnet, who saw her once a week during that summer, also warned the Queen of Monmouth's treachery, and the actions of the latter did not tend to increase Mary's confidence in him; 'he daily tells me of the great dangers we are in . . . he endeavours to fright me.'[40] In addition, Mary probably knew that such Whig politicians as the Dukes of Devonshire and Bolton, and Lord Montague, who refused to sign the warrant for the arrest of Ross, were also involved more or less seriously in the Scottish plot. The latter had many ramifications, both in England and Scotland, but it has not been thought necessary to trace its history in detail. To record the work of the Queen in dealing with the chief conspirators is our present object. Many other Scottish lords were implicated: there is a suggestion that there was an inner plot of which Ross, Montgomery, and Annandale were ignorant; Crone, who was betrayed by his colleague Fuller, was arrested, sentenced, and reprieved. Much of the

[38] In the Memoirs of James, Earl Balcarres, is the statement that the plot in which certain Scotch Whigs were concerned 'was in consequence of the same measure taken by the heads of the whole Whig party in England, disappointed in all the interested schemes they had formed' (Lives of the Lindseys, II. 175).

[39] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 30.

[40] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. 2, p. 128.

evidence must be submitted to penetrating criticism, for the plot-forger and the informer plied a nefarious trade.

There is some evidence that there were Jacobite schemes on foot during that summer which were more traitorous than the recall of James by parliamentary means and that Mary's situation was more dangerous then she had believed even in her times of most fearful apprehension. A document that has recently come to light records in picturesque language a meeting of Jacobites in Hyde Park in August, 1690, at which schemes against the life of the King and Queen were discussed. The informer, Roger Tilley, was hiding under the trees near the Birdcage in the Park and witnessed the meeting of seven or eight people, two of whom were addressed as 'Lady Oglethorp' and 'Sir Adam.' The latter, who was obviously a Scotsman from his accent, said that he had been at Court that evening, and had seen Her go to chapel, with but one gentleman that led her, and two more, and 'Her sixpenny beggars with their petitions.' Lady Oglethorp sighed and exclaimed: 'Ah! if it had been once done, all dangers were over, and noe person in England would be seane concerned: As for Him, I do ingage and promise you, gentlemen, that he shall never returne.' Lady Oglethorp 'then spoke words of her Majesty so base and ridiculous as are not fit to express,' and then said: 'As for that monkey, his business will be done, I am sure.' The Scotsman then said: 'When *Shee* was made an end of, nobody would be concerned for her . . . He would never appeare in England if he did 'scape them, but would return to Holland.' Then one of the number begged them to have no meetings in houses, nor to be seen together, for 'if this failed, all failed.'[41] Lady Ogle-

[41] Hist. MSS Comm., Finch II. 439.

thorp and Sir Adam Blair were conspicious adherents to the Jacobite cause.

The Earl of Annandale ever afterwards regarded Mary with respect and affection. In 1693 he became a member of the Scotch Privy Council, and distinguished himself by his zeal in the apprehension of Jacobite agents. In the autumn of that year he wrote to Secretary Johnstone stating his hope that his wife might become a lady-in-waiting to the Queen. In December, 1694, he became President of the Scotch Privy Council and wrote soon after to Bentinck, Lord Portland: 'I was wearie and uneasie under the weight of my crime long before I surrendered myself to her Majesty.'[42] When he heard of the Queen's illness he wrote to Johnstone: 'I am struck and confounded with the sad and deplorable account of the Queen's condition. If wee must lose the best of Queens, and the best of women, it is a heavy judgment . . . I must still hope, tho' with great fear and impatience, for if we lose her, the consequences are dreadful and inconceivable.'[43]

Mary did not hear until the 7th July of the success at the Boyne, and in the interval she was in perpetual fear for the safety of her husband and the success of their cause. She thus expressed herself to William: 'The thought that you thus expose yourself to danger frights me out of my wits, and makes me not able to keep my trouble to myself . . . Let me beg you to take more care for the time to come: consider what depends upon your safety: there are so many more important things than myself that . . . I am not worthy naming among them.'[44] On the 7th July the Committee of Council wrote to the King

[42] Hist. MSS Comm., Johnstone MSS, p. 68. [43] Ibid., p. 97.
[44] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. 2, p. 130.

congratulating him on the successful issue of the battle and requesting him to consider whether his presence was not more necessary in England, for there the French had it in their power to land where they pleased: 'whether we are able to oppose a foreign army, your Majesty can best judge. We have but few disciplined troops, and the militia, though considerable, zealous and well-affected, lack experience.'[45] Mary added her plea: 'I long to hear what you will say to the proposition that will be sent you this night by the Lords, and do flatter myself mightily with the hopes to see you.'[46] A week later, Secretary Nottingham wrote an even more importunate letter, referring to the ill condition of the fleet and to the fact that there were not above 5000 foot and 1000 horsemen, 'so that if the French should suddenly land, they might in a few days be masters of London and of the ships in the river.'[47]

Happily the French delayed the pursuit of the English fleet and did not take full advantage of the opportunities offered by their success. The panic caused by fear of foreign invasion gradually subsided, and much was made of the 'Queen's wise administration,' 'application to business,' and 'constancy of mind' under the great trial of government in William's absence.

Her skill in dealing with the conspiracy, the fortitude she exhibited during these months, and the charm of her personality, combined with William's success at the Boyne and the failure of the French to seize their opportunity, caused the temporary cessation of Jacobite intrigue. Burnet was able to write to his cousin, James Johnston, on the 14th October: 'I

[45] Hist. MSS Comm., Finch II. 347 f.
[46] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. 2, p. 135.
[47] Hist. MSS Comm., Finch II. 360.

have been now a week in town, and have had leisure and opportunities to inform myself of our affairs, and of the temper of people's minds . . . I was never more surprised in my whole life . . . to see the House of Commons in such a temper . . . They dare not go back into their country if they do not give money liberally . . . the French fleet by lying so long on our coast . . . has both united and animated the nation . . . and the King's behaviour in Ireland, as well as King James his meanness, has made so wonderful a change in all mens minds with relation to them both that we seem now not to be the same people that we were a year ago.'[48] The Queen recorded her own experience in her Memoirs thus: 'I am by nature timorous . . . but I knew . . . that God was above all . . . I did put my whole trust and confidence in Him, and He did keep me; for t'was thy hand, O Lord, and thine only, that kept all things here so quiet, tho' thou didst permit owr fleet to be beaten . . . the Lord was pleased to do more for me than I could hope . . . for he wonderfully preserved my husband, he gave him a great victory, he kept my father and him far from each other . . . and me from committing any great fault.'[49]

[48] Brit. Mus. Add. 34095, f. 160.

[49] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 32.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE VICTORY OF LA HOGUE AND ITS RESULTS

THE VICTORY of the Boyne and the flight of James II from Ireland made it possible for William to concentrate his attention more completely on France. The chief hindrance to his designs, however, was the existence still of Jacobitism in the British Isles. Scotland had to be pacified, Ireland to be subdued, and the plans of English plotters frustrated before William could act with any security against the French monarch.

The King left England in 1691 on the 16th January to attend in Holland what Mary called 'a great concourse of all people . . . and of . . . many considerable Princes.' She had great pride in his wide political influence. 'To show the difference I made between that journey and those wherein his person was exposed, I went once or twice to the play, I played every night at comet or basset, my sisters birthday I had dancing in my drawing room . . . but when the news of his being gone to the army came, I looked on my case as the most deplorable in the world.'[1]

Just before William's departure came the discovery of further Jacobite conspiracy. Lord Preston, formerly a minister of James, Richard Ashton, a servant of Mary of Modena, and a Mr. Elliot, were captured with treasonable correspondence on board a vessel bound for France. Ashton was tried, sentenced to death, and hanged. Mary did not agree to his execution without serious thought: 'I was perswaded he was justly condemned, and that at this time the necessities of affairs were

[1] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, pp. 36f.

such that I must let the law take its course . . . I had very well examined the thing beforehand, and was perfectly satisfied in my mind, yet I lookt on it as a misfortune to be obliged to refuse a mans life.'[2] A verdict of guilty was declared against Preston, but it was intimated that a full confession would secure pardon, and on the 23rd January he was reprieved for three weeks. The papers taken had proved the complicity of the Bishop of Ely, Lord Clarendon, and William Penn. Clarendon was lodged in the Tower, but the Bishop and Penn could not be found.

It was not until the middle of February that Sidney, Secretary of State in place of Shrewsbury, received a communication from Penn asking for an interview on condition that he should not be molested. 'I sent him word that I would if the Queen would permit it.' Sidney found Penn 'just as he used to be, not at all disguised, but in the same clothes and in the same humour I have formerly seen him in.'[3] The Quaker protested that he was a true and faithful servant of Queen Mary and King William and that he knew of no plot.[4]

Preston's fate was still undecided. The Queen was inclined to mercy, but her advisers were not yet satisfied that he had revealed all he knew. At length, at the end of May, a warrant granting pardon was signed, and Preston was liberated. Within a fortnight he was at Whitehall, surrounded by a curious crowd who had expected next to see him on the scaffold. He kissed publicly the hand of the Queen and expressed his deep gratitude for the grace that had been extended to him. 'I was very desirous that mercy might be shewn Lord Preston and Croon. And tho' they have not deserved it since, yet I cannot be sorry,

[2] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 40. [3] C. S. P. Dom. 1691-2, p. 282.
[4] Owing to Mary's influence, Penn was restored to the government o Pennsylvania in August, 1694 (C. S. P. Dom. 1694-5, p. 261).

but am glad they were pardoned,'[5] so reads Mary's final remark on the episode.

In her memoirs, the Queen records 'a very sad accident' that occurred on the 9th April, the Sunday before Easter, at which she was 'heartily frighted.' A contemporary named Fuller has left a graphic description of the crowd that assembled round Whitehall to witness the fire on that night, which can hardly be attributed to 'accident.' 'I could not get in with my chair, so went through Ax-yard, and as I was going up the back-stairs in the Park, I met about a dozen ladies coming down . . . all their hair about their ears, and in a strange confusion . . . I found these were the Queen and her ladies . . . They had not one man with them, for Her Majesty had been at the Earl of Dorset's lodgings to look at the fire . . . and then retired in haste . . . The Queen commanded me . . . to tell her guards where she was . . . I found them running about and enquiring for the Queen . . . I returned with them and Her Majesty was standing by the Dial in the Park . . . The Queen's footmen and other servants were come with lights, and Her Majesty walked very slowly, often turning back to look at the fire . . . At the second blowing up, she went in haste to Arlington House, and I was sent back to Whitehall to bring Her Majesty word how the fire was, and how near it had burnt to the King's apartment.' On his way, Fuller fell and stung his face so badly with the nettles that he could hardly see. 'The Queen was pleased to demand how I came so, in so short a time, and upon my relating it, her Majesty and all the company laughed most heartily. I never saw the Queen more pleasant in all my life-time than

[5] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, pp. 40 f.

she was that night.'[6] Buoyant laughter—a vivacious charming manner—and no betrayal of the mortal dread that filled her heart!

After a brief visit to England, William returned to Holland on the 1st May. The Queen 'parted with him with all the trouble and concern which can be felt in my circumstances which none can judge who have not felt the like.'[7] She then spent two or three days at Kensington, preparing to receive the sacrament and 'for the worst that might happen.' Many of her meditations she burnt fearing lest they should fall into unfriendly hands. Her journals she tied in a bag at her side, resolved 'if anything happened' to burn them. She knew that designs against the government were to be feared from three sides: 'Jacobites were to be assisted by, or would assist my sister, and the Commonwealth men would help neither of them for her, but both against me . . . This was very grievous to me to think my sister would be concerned in such things.'[8] She prayed often and committed herself to God, and so went about her business 'thincking as long as I was careful to do my duty to God and man, I might rest satisfied with whatever happend to my body, my soul would be happy: and thus I hasted to Whitehall, being so foolish as to fancy myself securer there than here, or at least thincking what ever happend I shoud have more company to suffer with me.'[9] These words betray a fear that may seem morbid, but the circumstances justified it. In further illustration of the spirit of this English Queen may be given an extract from a letter she wrote in July to Lady Rachel Russell: 'You are very much in the right to believe I

[6] Life of Fuller, pp. 61 f.
[7] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 38.
[8] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 38.
[9] Ibid., p. 39.

have cause enough to think this life not so fine a thing as it may be others do: that I lead at present . . . is so contrary to my own inclination that it can be neither easy nor pleasant: but I see one is not ever to live for one's self. I have had many years of ease and content, and was not so sensible of my own happiness as I ought, till I lost it; but I must be content with what it pleases God.'[10]

Not only in England was there the possibility of violence against the government. The war still dragged on in Ireland, and there was a strong faction in Scotland in bitter opposition to the new régime, for the discovery of the Whig plot of 1690 to recall James by parliamentary means, and Mary's success in dealing with the chief conspirators left the difficult problem of Scotch Jacobitism still unsolved. The Highland clans refused to swear allegiance to the new government. A letter written in May, 1689, and signed by seventeen Highland chiefs may be quoted as significant of their spirit: 'And that yow may know the sentiments of men of honour, we declaire to yow and all the world, we scorne your usurper and the indemnities of his government, and to save you further trowble by your frequent invitationes, wee assure you that wee are satisfied our King (will) take his owne Tyme and way to manage his dominiones, and punish his rebells; and although he should send no assistance to us at all, we will all dye with our swords in our hands before we faile in our loyalty and sworne allegiance to our soveraigne . . . Those . . . who live in islands have alreadie seen and defyed the Prince of Orange his friggots.'[11] Many of the Highlanders joined Claverhouse and helped to defeat Mackay at Killiecrankie in July, 1689. The hope of French invasion kept the clans during the next year still loyal to their Jacobite

[10] Letters of Lady Rachel Russell, II. 89.

[11] Hist. MSS Comm., Johnstone MSS, p. 55: Letter to Major-General Mackay.

allegiance. It was therefore necessary that some steps should be taken towards effecting a settlement, and this became imperative when the news of the surrender of Mons on the 8th April, 1691, encouraged once more the hopes of Highland Jacobites and their friends in Edinburgh. A scheme for pacification had been suggested to King William in 1690. Viscount Tarbet and the Earl of Breadalbane proposed the arrangement of a cessation of hostilities for the purpose of making treaty, 'your forces to be strictly posted on the frontier of the hills.'[12] But some members of the Scotch Privy Council did not regard hopefully the prospects of peaceful settlement: at the beginning of May, 1691, Colonel Hill received an order to fall upon the Highlanders within his reach who did not immediately take the oaths. Doubtless rumours of possible violence reached the chiefs, for on the 3rd June, Hill reported that many had come in 'and more were coming in dayly.' Then news came that four French ships had arrived at the Isle of Skye, with arms, money, and officers. The time was ripe for a definite declaration of policy on the part of the new government. The Queen, therefore, in the King's absence, signed instructions empowering the Earl of Breadalbane to meet and treat with the Highlanders, and to offer them their lives and fortunes on condition that they gave assurance not to join until the 1st October with any foreign force, nor to commit acts of hostility. The question of taking the oaths was in abeyance.

From the middle of May many of the principal Scotch Lords were in London, assiduously paying court to the Queen. It may reasonably be supposed that they had heard of plans for the pacification of the Highland rebels, and that they knew well

[12] C. S. P. Dom. 1690-1, p. 209.

the Queen's desire to bestow mercy and to avoid bloodshed. Blanchard, an *habitué* of the court during the summer months of 1691, records a conversation he had with Moray, the Jacobite son of the Marquis of Athol. He exhorted him to return to his duty and to attach himself to the new government. Moray replied that he was awaiting events, and 's'il faisoit quelque chose il ne seroit pas plus malheureux que les autres et que lue governement ne punit personne; que la grâce accordée à my Lord Preston marque bien qu'à l'imitation du bon Dieu on ne veut point la mort du pécheur mais sa conversion et sa vie.'[13]

Lord Breadalbane was in Scotland by the 26th June, and by the middle of July news of the successful issue of the negotiations had reached the Queen. She immediately commanded the Duke of Leinster, the commander-in-chief of the Army, to send orders to Sir Thomas Levingston 'not to march or encamp near the borders of the Highlands unless by any insurrection given just occasion for it . . . Her Majesty also writes to Duke Hamilton [the President of the Scotch Privy Council] to acquaint him with the reasons of this order which are that her Majesty, having good cause to be satisfied with the Earl of Breadalbane's negotiations and . . . probably the King will be so too . . . does not think it proper to give them any ground to suspect any violence against them, so long as they demeane themselves peaceably, and until the King's pleasure be known upon this whole matter. I have not seen the Queen's letter, but her Majesty was pleased to tell me this should be the effect of it . . . The reasons you give for sending a flying packet were satisfactory to the Queen . . . The Queen must not be debarred of having account of any matters from any of her subjects there

[13] Hist. MSS Comm., App. to 7th Rep., Denbigh MSS, p. 199.

who desire to acquaint her Majesty thereupon by a particular hand,'[14]—so wrote Nottingham to the Duke of Leinster.

There was soon a breach of the truce.[15] One Stewart of Appin 'injuriously robed and seazed' some of Colonel Hill's soldiers, and then wrote to him an insolent letter. Appin and about a dozen others were apprehended and by order of the Scotch Privy Council taken to the Tolbooth at Glasgow. Mary was then asked to state her pleasure as to the future of the prisoners. Her reply was: 'Wee having perused yours to us . . . and the copies of the letters . . . are of the opinione that the said . . . Steuart of Appine and the other persones . . . be sett at liberty. And soe we bidd you heartily ffarewell. Given at oure Courte of Whytehall the ffourth day of August, 1691, and of our reigne the third year. Sic Subscribitur M.R.'[16] A warrant was at once issued for liberating the prisoners.

On the 29th July, the day on which the Duke of Hamilton wrote asking the Queen's pleasure about Stewart of Appin, Sir Thomas Levingston placed before the Scotch Privy Council an order from the Duke of Leinster, containing 'particular directions' from the Queen, the purport of which has already been stated. The Scotch lords were in a position of peculiar difficulty: they had before them a letter from King William, dated June 15-25th, from Flanders, ordering that Levingston should march with the troops under his command and encamp near the bor-

[14] Finch Papers, Public Record Office, London.

[15] J. Paget, in the New Examen, pp. 62 f., tries to prove that the clans lived in peace during that summer. In one of Colonel Hill's letters in June is the statement: 'The Appin and Glencoe men have desired they may go in to my Lord Argyle, because he is their superior' (Leven and Melvill Papers, p. 607). This coupling together of the two clans is significant.

[16] Papers Illustrative of the Highlands of Scotland, p. 31.

ders of the Highlands without committing any act of hostility.[17] Which order was to be obeyed,—that of the King or the later one from the Queen? On the 23rd July William had sent further orders, but there is no evidence that these had reached Scotland by the 29th. Their receipt would have much increased the perplexity of the Council, for they contained the statement that his Majesty expected that Levingston had already encamped his troops near the borders of the Highlands: 'His Majesty does require you to continue his forces so encamped till you receive his further pleasure.'[18]

The debate in the Council must have been lengthy and heated. The letter that was at length sent to the Queen stated that *they*, the councillors, had given orders to Levingston to stop the march of the troops, because no commission to a commander-in-chief such as Leinster could be recognised in Scotland until it had been presented to the Scotch Council, or had passed under their great seal.[19] Thus, technically, it was not *Mary's* order to the Duke of Leinster that was observed in opposition to the order of the King, but one from the Scotch Privy Council. Duke Hamilton, however, was not quite at ease. On the 3rd August he wrote to Melvill, who was in London: 'The different orders from the King and Queen lookes very odd to us at a distance, and I wish the Queen be not impossed upon, which your Lordship . . . may . . . easily discover, and put her Majesty on her gard and indevore to hasten

[17] Ibid., p. 23. Stair communicated this news to Breadalbane on the same day: 'But if they will be mad, before Lammas, they will repent it; for the army will be allowed to go into the Highlands, which some thirst so much for' (Dalrymple's Memoirs, Part 4, App., p. 210).

[18] Papers Illustrative of the Highlands of Scotland, p. 23. [19] Ibid., p. 634.

a return that the season of the year be not lost.'[20] Melvill waited upon the Queen, and as a result the following letter was signed by her: 'We doe heirby acquaint yow that the Earl of Breadalbane's negotiatione with the Highlanders . . . was done by the King's command, and concerning which yow will in a short tyme know his further pleasure. We doe lykewayes acquaint yow that the order by the Duke of Leinster . . . was sent to him by our directione.'[21]

By the third week in July, Breadalbane was in London and the report that he then gave to the Queen may have been partly responsible for her order of the 22nd through the Duke of Leinster. From the preceding, it will be seen that the Queen felt herself able to adopt a policy different from that of her husband. That she later convinced him of the wisdom of her action is certain from a letter that she sent to the Scotch Privy Council on the 25th August 'anent the army': 'the stopping of the march of our troops towards the Highlanders were noe less agreeable to the King's inclinatione than to our opinione.'[22] She doubtless also realised the importance of removing any suspicion of opposition between them.

On the 17th August the announcement was made that all rebels who had taken the oath of allegiance by the 1st January, 1692, should be pardoned and indemnified, and that £12,000 should be spent in accommodating various differences and feuds, and purchasing peace and concord.[23] The story of the tragedy that followed is well known, and there is need to do little more than refer to it. There is no question that William signed the infamous order of the 16th January, 1692: 'If Mackean of Glencoe and that tribe can be well separated from the rest,

[20] Papers illustrative of the Highlands of Scotland, p. 27. [21] Ibid., p. 30.
[22] Ibid., p. 42. [23] C. S. P. Dom. 1690-1, pp. 489 f.

it will be a proper vindication of the public justice to extirpate that sept of thieves.'[24] From what we know of Mary, we may be certain that when the story of the treachery and cruelty of that act in the wild glen reached London, probably in March, her heart was filled with horror. Some enquiry was made in 1693 into the mystery that then surrounded the tragedy, but no further steps were taken until April, 1695, when William authorised the issue of a commission for a further enquiry. A report of the work of the commission was read in Parliament on the 24th June, 1695, but not published officially until 1704. A copy of it was sold in pamphlet form in London in 1703, and prefixed to the papers was the following letter 'unfortunately but necessarily anonymous,' which refers to the enquiry of 1693: 'Mr. Johnston, who was at this time Secretary of State for Scotland, had particular directions from the late Queen Mary to push on this enquiry, and search into the bottom of that horrid murder, for her Majesty was grieved at the heart that the reputation of the King . . . should have suffered so much by that affair . . . His diligence to serve and obey the Queen in this matter was always judged here to be one of the chief causes of our nation's losing that able and honest minister.'[25] The result of the enquiry of 1693 was not published.

The documents revealing Mary's influence on the suppression of Irish Jacobitism are less numerous than those relating to Scotch affairs, but there is clear evidence that she displayed towards Ireland the same merciful and conciliatory spirit.

From the time that William withdrew from Limerick in 1690, until the following May, there were no military operations on a

[24] Ibid., 1691-2, p. 102.
[25] Papers Illustrative of the Highlands of Scotland, pp. 117 f.

large scale in Ireland. The first months of the year were spent in preparing for the coming campaign. The army under General Ginkel was in need of reinforcements, money, and ammunition. Marauding bands of 'rapparees' were very numerous, and many men had to be employed to guard provisions and to secure the towns already in English hands, men who could be ill spared from the army that was to take the offensive against the Irish, recently strengthened and encouraged by the arrival of Tyrconnel from France with provisions and arms, money, and clothing. In February the Queen discussed with Godolphin the question of monetary supplies for Ireland, and was relieved when he assured her that there would be money for half-pay, and for the subsistence of the soldiers for some time longer. Carmarthen had a very pessimistic view of the condition of affairs in Ireland, and even proposed that the King should supersede the two Lords Justices, in whose hands was the civil administration of the country, by himself as Lord Lieutenant, stating that he would rather perish in trying to save the government than live to perish with it, 'which I may probably do if Ireland should cost another year's war.'[26] An opinion generally held in London was that on the successful issue of events in Ireland depended the future prosperity of the Kingdom.

On the 19th June the English army appeared before Athlone. In the meantime, the King having more than once urged the importance of bringing the Irish to submission almost upon any terms, the Lords Justices prepared a proclamation which was to be published when they had gained a sufficient military advantage over the enemy. 'Though we believe that we are already sufficiently authorised to publish the proclamation . . .

[26] C. S. P. Dom. 1690-1, p. 271.

yet it is a business of such great importance that we durst not venture it without first laying it before her Majesty to have her approbation, and beg that her commands in this affair may be returned with all possible expedition . . . We propose, if her Majesty approves of it, that this proclamation be published in her name being of opinion that it would be of greater force, and meet with more credit than if set out in ours.'[27] Mary gave her consent to the proclamation's being published, and this was followed by a letter which is worthy of quotation: 'Her Majesty thinks it may be useful to let the rebels know the power she has of pardoning such as will return to their obedience, if this can be conveyed to them conveniently, for as she would not expose her favour to be contemned by them by an untimely publication of it, so on the other hand, she would not have them hardened in rebellion by a despair of mercy.'[28]

Athlone fell on the 30th June, and twelve days later was fought the decisive battle of Aughrim, at which the Irish were severely defeated. The standards and colours taken there were afterwards presented to the Queen. Then followed the flight to Galway, and the latter's speedy capitulation. Limerick was the last asylum of the vanquished people. Articles of Capitulation were signed there on October 3rd. 'The Irish were all

[27] C. S. P. Dom. 1690-1, p. 394. On the same day, Porter, one of the Lords Justices, wrote to Sidney, Secretary of State, thus: 'It will be absolutely necessary upon any terms, to end the war in this Kingdom this summer, and the most probable means will be by giving those large terms mentioned in the proclamation . . . We are of opinion that if the Proclamation be under the Queen's hand, the Irish will have greater confidence in it than if in our name . . . I believe it will be extremely censured by two sorts of people: the English here will be offended that the Irish are not quite beggared, and what the House of Commons will say to it . . . your Lordship can better judge than I' (C. S. P. Dom. 1690-1, pp. 393 f).

[28] Finch MSS, Public Record Office.

indemnified and restored to all that they had enjoyed in King Charles' time, and were admitted to all the privileges of subjects upon their taking the oaths of allegiance to their Majesties, without being bound to take the oath of supremacy.'[29] The Queen ordered that the French soldiers and any of the Irish who wished to go should be allowed to cross in safety to France. It was late on Monday, the 12th October, when a messenger brought official news of the capitulation. He was at once conducted by Blancard to the Queen, who was playing at basset. She received the news with 'great joy,' and sent the messenger the next day to carry it to the King in Holland.

The proclamation declaring the war at an end was issued on the 5th March, 1692. To whom must be assigned the responsibility for the subsequent breaking of the pledges given to the vanquished people? The war had to be ended upon almost any terms; the man who wielded most power in Ireland at that time was General Ginkel, not an Englishman; the King and Queen disliked persecution and preferred when possible to adopt a conciliatory policy: these were the conditions that governed the signing of the treaty. Those responsible for the Articles of Capitulation may have exceeded their instructions, but, once signed, the Treaty should have been strictly adhered to. The rapacity of self-seeking politicians, the force of an uneducated public opinion, and the fears of a narrow and intolerant Protestantism must be blamed for this episode in English history for which there is reason to feel shame.

At the beginning of October, 1691, Mary was eagerly expecting the King's return. Parliament was to be opened on the 22nd, and if he were delayed, it would be necessary to arrange

[29] History of My Own Times, Burnet, IV. 145.

for a short prorogation, 'mais il semble qu'on ne feroit pas mal si la Reyne commençoit la séance,'[30] so at least one contemporary thought. The King, however, arrived in time. As he was assisted from his carriage at Whitehall, he asked if the Queen were in the Palace, and being informed that she had been long awaiting him, he hurried through the royal apartments in haste to reach her chamber, and there saluted her affectionately. But even with the King at her side, Mary was not free from anxiety concerning him. She was warned a few weeks later that there was to be an attempt upon his life, but 'elle ne s'en mit point en peine.' At half past three on the morning of the 10th or 11th November, she was awakened at Kensington by the sound of musketry. A moment afterwards the King was told that the Palace was on fire. Portland was sent to get assistance, for there was no means at Kensington of quenching the flames, but it was six o'clock before help came. The King and the Queen, in the meantime, seeing that the fire gained on their apartments, ordered the contents to be placed in the garden. In the grey morning mist the figures of their Majesties 'en deshabille' with about a dozen others were dimly discernible. They both laughed very heartily as they later described the way in which they had passed the night 'parmi les dames en chemise qui fuyoient par peur sans danger.' Nothing was lost 'pas même la pourcelaine qui étoit rangée dans le jardin avec les tableaux et les meubles.' The King walked about inspecting the bundles that had been brought out of the palace, and was especially amused when he discovered a Dutch cheese, bottles, and bread.

When the Queen first heard the firing, she thought at once of the warning she had received. 'Elle pria Dieu, et sur le champ

[30] Hist. MSS Comm., App. to 7th Rep., p. 204.

sortant du lit ouvrit la porte de sa chambre.' The King wanted to set out immediately for Whitehall, but Mary, without telling him what she had learnt, detained him, fearing that the fire had been started to force the King out on foot in the night, when a stray shot might have proved effective, without leading to a discovery of the traitor.[31]

In the early part of 1692, there seemed little likelihood of immediate danger to the English government from Ireland and Scotland. Therefore, although he knew that Jacobitism was strong in England, before William left for Flanders on the 4th March, he had resolved that an invasion of France should be attempted that summer. On the 22nd March Mary formally announced to the Cabinet Council the King's resolution that a descent should be made on St. Malo and Brest.[32] Preparations were made for an adequate supply of provisions for the troops, and there was much activity in the ports. Ships were ordered to be ready for the transport of men by the end of April.[33] At the beginning of that month, the Queen was 'alarmed by severall private intimations of the danger we were in of an invasion

[31] 'I was not without my fears again at the latter end of the summer, being frigted, as I thought upon very good grounds, with designs deep and well-laid upon his life, at his return, and this almost made my illness return' (Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 42).

[32] The Duke of Leinster, Lord Galway, and Admiral Russell, who had been appointed to the command of the home fleet in the preceding December were summoned to conferences, at which plans for the proposed descent, were discussed. Burnet doubts if any preparations for a descent were made.

[33] The financing of the project, for which Godolphin was responsible, caused him much anxiety. 'We have given all the necessary orders . . . though still I cannot help looking upon it as . . . subject to a great deal of hazard and uncertainty. The expense of the transportation will be about £20,000 and of the provisions . . . £30,000 . . . of the ordnance, we do not know . . . but they speak of sums that I am afraid to repeat to you' (Godolphin to William, C. S. P. Dom. 1691-2, p. 199).

from abroad, helpd by very strong conspiracies at home . . . I did not regard it till it was confirmed so many wais that it was no longer to be doubted . . . No time was lost in giving all the necessary orders for owr safety.'[34] The news of the massing of troops on the shores of France, and of the concentration of French ships caused a change in English naval plans. With the imminence of invasion, Mary and her councillors had quickly to make arrangements for defence.

Who were involved in the 'very strong conspiracies' at home to which Mary alluded? Her knowledge of Jacobite intrigue during 1691 was mainly based on the reports of spies and on current rumours, and on information contained in intercepted letters, some of them probably of doubtful authenticity. It is certain, however, that Jacobite agents sought interviews with Marlborough, Godolphin, Halifax, and Russell, and that more or less satisfactory professions of loyalty to James were made. On the 1st December, 1691, occurred the writing by Anne of that curious letter to her father of penitence and loyalty.[35] She was undoubtedly persuaded to do this by the Marlboroughs, who hoped that James would regard it as a concrete expression of their zeal for his cause. In addition, Marlborough gave information about the army and navy, and 'whatever was intended by sea or land.'[36] It is likely that he was also carrying on intrigues not in the interest of James, but of Anne, then so completely under the domination of Lady Marlborough.

In January, 1692, London was astir with the news that Marlborough had been dismissed from all offices. The Queen probably knew no more than that there had been correspondence between

[34] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 49. [35] J. S. Clarke's Life of James II, II. 477f.
[36] For the evidence against Marlborough, see the article in the English Historical Review, July, 1920.

the Cockpit—Anne's household—and Saint Germaine, and that Marlborough had been involved in a conspiracy to place Anne on the throne, a conspiracy of which the latter had remained in ignorance.—'When I told her the rapports, and she denyed them, 't'is probable she was sincere.'[37]

So, in the early summer of 1692, Mary had to face the possibility of a successful French invasion led by her father, which might be followed by a general abandonment of her cause; her sister would forsake her; some of the officers of the army and navy, and many of the politicians with whom she was working each day, would be quick to pay homage to the old King, and William would probably be unable to reach the shores of England. Did she contemplate what her fate might be?

When rumours of a likely invasion reached England, Mary wrote in her memoirs: 'We were very much unprovided and our enemies seemd so sure that I thought . . . I had very good reasons to believe all in great danger . . . I was told of . . . dreadful designs against myself . . . I own I was in very great apprehensions.'[38] That William believed that she was in dire need of support and honest advice may be seen from the fact that on the 2nd May Portland arrived in London, bringing a message that the King would come himself if he heard of any actual landing. 'That was the greatest trouble of all . . . I dreaded to thinck my father and husband might once more meet in the field; and the fears that my father might fall by our arms, or either of them fall where t'other was present, was to me the dreadfullest prospect in the world . . . but I had a great confidence in God.'[39]

From the 29th April, when Admiral Russell took formal

[37] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 45. [38] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 48. [39] Ibid.

leave of the Queen until the 19th May, when the Battle of La Hogue was fought, Mary's life was one of great anxiety.

On the 3rd May she was present at a meeting of the Privy Council at which warrants were signed for the arrest of suspected persons, including Marlborough, on the charge of 'high treason in abetting and adhering to their Majesties' enemies,' and Russell, who was still in London, was asked to appear before the presence of the Queen at 4 o'clock that afternoon. For some reason he failed to do so, and Nottingham wrote to him that Marlborough had been secured. 'This will be very unwelcome news to Captain Churchill, but I am commanded to tell you that you may assure him that whatever reasons Her Majesty may have to shew her displeasure to my Lord Marlborough, it does not extend to his brother . . . Her Majesty still relies upon his fidelity, and dos not doubt his behaviour will be suitable to the trust reposed upon him.'[40] Before response could be received from Russell, Nottingham had news of a different nature to send him: there were such convincing proofs of Lord Marlborough's ill designs against the government that it was thought to be imprudent 'in this juncture' to continue his brother in so great a trust as a first rate ship, and he was therefore to be discontinued from that employment. Within a few days a letter from Russell was considered by the Queen and her cabinet, and as a result the Admiral was told that 'the Queen dos so fully rely upon you and the character and assurances you give of Mr. Churchill that she will not think any more of removing him.'[41]

The following days were full of gloomy augury to the anxious Queen. Masses of troops were assembled on the shores of

[40] Finch MSS, Public Record Office. [41] Ibid.

Normandy, ready to be transported to England as soon as a naval victory should make possible a safe passage. The Dutch ships had not yet joined the English fleet, and rumours of a wholesale desertion in the Jacobite interest became even more persistent. On the 15th another letter was dispatched to Russell which may be attributed entirely to the Queen's wise insight into human nature: 'I do not know but the reports of the Town may have reached the officers of the fleet, that many of them have promised to desert, and upon this suspicion they were ordered to be turned out; I am confident these rumours are spread on purpose to create a distrust in the Queen of the officers, and in the officers of the government, for I can trace these reports to some here in town that I am sure wish the destruction of it . . . No such proposal has ever been made to the Queen, or mentioned at the cabinet but as a thing which our enemies maliciously wish, so the Queen commands me to tell you that nothing of this nature can make any impression upon her, but that she reposes an entire confidence in them all, and will never think that any brave English seaman will betray Her or his country to the insolent tyranny of the French; and as it is their duty and their glory to defend the government, it shall be her part to reward their service. This she would have you communicate to them all with the first opportunity.'[42] The Admiral at once acquainted the chief officers with the purport of this politic letter. The result was that an Address of Loyalty signed by sixty-four names was forwarded by Russell to the Admiralty, which he begged the Commissioners 'to present to her Majesty with all imaginable assurances of loyalty and fidelity.'[43] The Queen received the address 'very graciously,'

[42] Finch MSS, Public Record Office.
[43] House of Lords MSS, 1692-3, p. 234. See Appendix, p. 206.

saying that she had always had this opinion of the commanders, but was very glad this was come to satisfy others. Thus did Mary deal with the precarious naval situation.

Nottingham wrote a letter on the 6th May to Blathwayt, who was with William in Flanders, which gives more information concerning the precautionary measures taken by the Queen. 'That which is the greatest importance is the resolution the Queen has taken to turn out and of ordering to be seized some officers of the army, and this night warrants are signed for that purpose. This was done upon consideration of this matter by the Duke of Leinster . . . and his representation to the Queen that they were not to be trusted in this conjuncture . . . I hope this will have no ill consequence, but their treachery in those parts would be fatal.'[44] From the camp near Brussels on the 16-26th May, William wrote to Portland: 'La capation et arrest des offitiers que la Reine a fait est une chose bien délicate, et l'un ne peut pas bien ou mal fait.'[45] The King certainly allowed Mary a certain independence of judgment and action. Moreover, she displayed an independence with which she is not often credited at a cabinet meeting in May at which a list of persons to be apprehended as dangerous was placed before her, at the head of which stood the name of Thomas, Earl of Ailesbury. She said that he had been made sufficiently uneasy two years before and for nothing, and expressed her pleasure that his name should be omitted. Nottingham pleaded the receipt of orders from the King. Mary with some warmth cried: 'My lord, show me your orders!' The response was: 'Madam, we

[44] Finch MSS, Public Record Office. 'Several persons had been sent over to put such as were disposed to assist the king at his landing in a readiness to do it, and to command them when they ris' (Clarke's Life of James II, II. 478).

[45] Brit Mus. Add. 34514. f. 79.

have received orders to clap up a certain number.' The Queen, laughing, observed: 'I thought persons were to be taken up for crimes, and not to make up numbers, as they empanel jurymen.' Another list was then presented to her, at the top of which was the name of Lord Scarsdale. 'Stop there, my Lord; since you will have your number, put in that Lord's name instead of my Lord Ailesbury's, and if titles please you, there is an Earl for an Earl. What is sauce for one is sauce for another.' 'But there is nothing against my Lord Scarsdale,' Nottingham remonstrated. 'Just as much as against my Lord Ailesbury, and I will have it so,' rejoined the Queen.[46]

'Before our fleet was joind, we had news of the French being in the channel,'[47] wrote the Queen in her memoirs. By the 15th the allied fleets were assembled, for Russell was able to write: 'The Dutch number twenty-two, so that with our own we shall make up 79 sail.'[48] A council of war was held on board, at which it was resolved 'not to proceed to the westward of St Helens till there be certain advice that the French fleet is on our coast, and then to endeavour to fight them . . . to come to an anchor on the French coast, and ride there one day if it be fair weather.'[49] Russell had previously come to the conclusion that the French would abandon their projected invasion 'till they beat us' in a battle, which he believed they would not attempt until they were forced to it.[50]

[46] Memoirs of Thomas, Earl of Ailesbury, I. 298. The evidence of Ailesbury must always be submitted to close scrutiny: he is notoriously inaccurate. On May 9th, however, a proclamation to apprehend certain persons for high treason was published, and the list of names was headed by that of the Earl of Scarsdale (C. S. P. Dom. 1692, p. 72 6). Ailesbury and his sisters had been playfellows of the two daughters of James II.

[47] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 49.

[48] House of Lords MSS, 1692, p. 204. Historians have usually stated the number of ships to be ninety-nine (Mahan, *Influence of Sea Power*, p. 189).

[49] Ibid., p. 211.

[50] In making this judgment, he revealed his own understanding of a funda-

The two fleets met on the 19th, however. The French fleet did not exceed fifty ships of war.[51] The weather was foggy and there was a light wind blowing from the west, which made it impossible for the French ships to escape the doom that was upon them. In the fight that followed they were everywhere beaten and dispersed. Russell and Delavel pursued and destroyed those that, with the help of a north-west wind in the afternoon, were trying to reach Cherbourg and La Hogue. The only vessels that escaped destruction were those that found refuge in the harbour of St. Malo. On the 23rd Russell was at anchor in La Hogue Bay, 'where in the harbour are great numbers of transport ships . . . When I depart from hence, I design for St. Helens.'[52]

The victory of La Hogue was won by action which was in direct opposition to the orders of the Queen and her political advisers, but the letter containing their commands fortunately did not reach Russell until the day after the battle. On the 17th Nottingham wrote that 'some ships' were to be left on the coast of Normandy to provide against a possible French invasion, but such a possibility should not 'frustrate the whole summer's service, and therefore the whole naval power should not be employed about Cape de Hague and St. Helens, but that . . . he should proceed with the fleet to Brest.'[53] Russell refers to these orders in a characteristic letter: 'I received her Majesty's order the day after we had fought, and though I will now say very little of the order, yet give me leave to

mental principle of naval strategy–that an invasion could not be attempted with hope of success until command of the sea had been secured.

[51] Russell's letter of 23rd May, House of Lords MSS, 1692, p. 211. The number of the French ships is usually put at forty-four.

[52] House of Lords MSS, 1692, p. 211.

[53] Commons Journals, p. 212.

observe that it plainly appears to me that her Majesty, when in the cabinet council, was of the same opinion of the town, that I had neither used my diligence in joining the fleet nor made dispatch in sailing from St. Helens, as also that her Majesty was advised to show in her order a dislike to the Resolution the Council of War took in sailing to this place. But the event has, I hope, justified my opinion, and these were my reasons for so doing: was not this the place from whence you apprehended the transport to be made? were you not assured the enemy's fleet was coming to convey them over? could any danger come to England by their fleet appearing on our coast? All these things made it plain to my reason that here we should meet them . . . I have done with this subject, only I must bear it so much in my mind that I will never more put myself under the possibility of being ill-treated . . . I think you may take little care about the French for one or two years; 'twill require that time to make up their losses and put themselves in condition to dispute with you.'[54]

Mary's letters to William after 1690 have presumably not been preserved, and we are therefore without details of the cabinet consultations which resulted in the sending of Nottingham's letter of the 17th to Russell. The Admiral's opinion concerning the unlikelihood of the French attempting an invasion while the English fleet remained intact, may have had some influence on the deliberations; or it may have been William's strong desire that an attempt on Brest should be made. The Queen's having consented to the issue of such an order is evidence of her courage: her apprehensions of danger were always so intense that she would find it hard to persuade

[54] Hist. MSS Comm., Downshire MSS, I. 405 f.

herself that there would be no French invasion at that time if the protection of the English fleet were removed.

She was suffering much under the stress of anxiety, and recorded in her diary her emotions and thoughts in her simple and direct style. 'We were very much unprovided, and owr enemies seemed so sure that I . . . thought I had very good reasons to believe all in great danger . . . God alone delivered us . . . and gave all owr ships time to join, which they had no sooner done but the French, as it were, fell into their mouths. . . . The happy news came to us on the 21st May, but yet left room for fears. . . . I gave myself over to joy.'[55]

The Queen was at that time much troubled about events in Flanders. William tried to spare her knowledge that would add to her anxiety, for in a letter to Portland, dated the 13th-23rd May, he wrote that if Namur were attacked, he would try to save it, cost what it might, 'ne dites point à la Reine que vous avez reçu cette lettre puisque je ne lui escrit point, et que ce que je vous écrit lui ne peut donner que de l'inquiétude.'[56] But from her own memoirs we discover that Mary knew of the course of events. 'The meanwhile I heard that Namur was beseiged, and the King of France come in person, my husband gone there to raise the seige, so that in all likelihood some decisive action was to be expected. I never was in that condition in my life: The King's person, which was dearer to me than my own, exposed on one hand; the fate of England, on the other, depending on our success at sea; if the King should fall, all, humanly speacking, would fall with him; if our fleet was beaten, we knew there was an army ready to devour us from abroad, and a strong faction to help it at home.' When

[55] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, pp. 48-50. [56] Brit. Mus. Add. 34513, f. 79.

the news of the success of La Hogue came: 'I find I was more stupified than I believed at that time. My sex was not able to bear those violent passions, those fears, those joys, those troubles which I had either together, or just upon one another.'[57]

Then occurred an incident which Mary afterwards remembered to her 'eternal shame and confusion.' She deferred offering a public thanksgiving for the victory of La Hogue, until news should come of the result of the conflict in Flanders. During the interval of a fortnight, she 'let herself go,' and 'fancied a thousand fine things of the King's victory,' in which there was 'too much desire of glory' for him. 'We in England, we who had the most cause, since we had the greatest benefit of the victory, were the only people who returned . . . no solemn thancks.'[58]

Russell was commanded by the Queen to remain at St. Helens in order to help forward the 'proposed methods of an invasion.'[59] He was in complete agreement with the Queen and the cabinet on the importance of hastening forward these preparations: 'Now is the time, if you are able to make the descent . . . I suppose her Majesty will command the fleet to sea as soon as it is fitted . . . If the men designed for a descent can be got ready, now is the time to push it while the Iron is hot; and I am certain France is in a greater fright about a descent than we were here . . . If that cannot be performed, I do not know what to propose to do with your fleet.'[60]

William had strategic reasons for his plan of an invasion of France that summer. He anticipated that Louis XIV would

[57] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 50. [58] Ibid., pp. 51 f.
[59] Finch MSS, Public Record Office. 'To this end, all the troops are quartered about Portsmouth, and the transport ships will immediately be dispatched thither' (Nottingham to Russell, ibid.). [60] Ibid.

try to take by storm the town of Namur, the great bulwark of Brabant and Liege, the loss of which might have very serious effects. A successful invasion at Brest would weaken the forces of Louis at Namur. On the 16th May the French King appeared before the town, and the attack began on the 20th, the day after the battle of La Hogue. William ably defended the citadel until the 30th June, when it fell. The military operations of that summer were disastrous; William was defeated again at Steinkirke on 24th July-3rd August.

In the meantime, the Queen was watching the progress of naval affairs with great anxiety: 'On the first August, I had . . . a thing which troubled me . . . and that was a letter from Mr. Russell who, after having joyned the Duke of Leinster with the land forces, writes word, nothing could be done; so they were coming back to St. Eldens. This . . . was a real trouble and vexation . . . All the expence was thrown away, the troops came back as they went, having made us ridiculous to all the world by our great preparations to no purpose. This . . . was a very sensible trouble to me, but it was . . . a just punishment upon the pride of the nation and that to great desire I had, that some great thing should be done.'[61] Mary also makes reference to Mr. Russell's 'strange letters,' wherein he seemed 'dissatisfied and did nothing but talck of retiring, and did really from that time hinder as much as he could.' Many people were 'discontented and unreasonable' in complaining that no ships were taken at La Hogue, and that the victory was not followed up as it should have been. Some blamed Russell 'as one who had but fought in his own defence,' and others laid the blame on the cabinet council. Then came

[61] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 54.

the two months in which all efforts were concentrated on preparation for the invasion. 'Care was taken, orders were given, and yet nothing went on as it should . . . A woman is seldom good for anything, and here it was plainly seen, and that vext me too much.'[62] The Queen had a strong sense of responsibility for the political events of the periods of her administration, but she cannot be blamed for the disappointing result of the La Hogue victory. She realised her own inexperience of naval affairs, and had good sense enough not to use her authority to oppose the judgments of those in whom she believed she might place confidence.

To Russell's Jacobite sympathies has always been attributed the failure to follow up adequately the brilliant success of La Hogue. A revision of judgment seems necessary in consideration of documentary evidence that has recently come to light. After the battle the King and the Queen, the cabinet and the Admiral, were all in favour of making the long-projected attempt on France, yet, on the 6th June, eighteen days after, orders were sent to Russell to sail to St. Malo for the purpose of destroying the remnant of the French fleet that had taken refuge there.[63] The invasion had to be abandoned because neither the military forces nor the transport ships could be ready until the end of July,[64] owing mainly to the want of ready money and to the chaos and corruption in the administrative departments. Before sailing Russell had stated the opinion that military

[62] Ibid., p. 53.

[63] Burnet lays stress upon Russell's failure to follow up his victory after La Hogue, and alleges that he soon came into harbour and 'wasted all the summer.' He was blamed because he failed to destroy the French ships, that escaped. The indecision of the cabinet was responsible for the delay.

[64] Burchett says: 'By the 8th July, the transport ships were not arrived at Portsmouth from the river' (Burchett, p. 157). The soldiers were not shipped until the 22nd July, nor the horsemen until the 25th.

forces might be of great use for the St. Malo project, but he could not have them, and cruised until the 1st July without fulfilling his mission. Further imperative orders were at once sent to him. 'Her Majesty thinks it necessary that I should write to you again upon this subject . . . The Queen is resolved to have the destruction of the St. Malo ships attempted if it be possible.'[65] Russell's reply was that no care or industry had been wanting on his part: 'Half the number of men a month since would have performed what can be expected from Double their numbers now.' The Queen repeated her command, and Russell sailed the day after, only to be forced back by stormy weather and the need of revictualling the ships. One of the chaplains cruising with the fleet has left testimony to the abnormally cold, rainy, and stormy weather experienced at sea that summer,[66] and in the days of sailing vessels weather was obviously an important factor. It was not until the beginning of August that military forces under the Duke of Leinster joined the fleet, and then—as Mary has described—to no purpose. The conditions of naval architecture at that time made it impossible to attempt hazardous enterprises at sea, needing first or second rate ships which were difficult to manage under sail in heavy weather, after the beginning of August. That month was then regarded by naval experts as 'late in the season.' Considerations such as these should be taken into account in

[65] House of Lords MSS.

[66] 'June 24th. The Almanacks call this Midsummer-Day. It may have been so formerly, but I am sure it is not so now . . . how it blows and rains. I dare challenge any day in winter to compare with this midsummer day for cold rainy and stormy weather . . . June 25th. Why, certainly, the whole course of Nature is inverted . . . here's Winter all the year round, and the weather as bad or worse than it was on Midsummer Day' (Bodl. Godw. Pamph., 1165).

alleging disloyalty on the part of Russell as the cause of the disappointing result of La Hogue.

From whom came the suggestion that Russell should have some dignity conferred upon him for the success of La Hogue is uncertain, but it is at least likely that the Queen first thought of it. She told Lady Rachel Russell in a letter on the 18th October that she had seen Mr. Russell that day, but 'he is resolved to be Mr. Russell still. I could not press him further on a thing he seemed so little to care for, so there is an end of the matter . . . At present I have not much time; I hope soon to have more by the King's coming . . . in a few days.'[67]

William returned to Kensington on the 20th, and Mary met him with a 'true joy . . . but we were both melancholy at the ill prospect of things.' The Queen then gave herself to her 'own ease and carelessness for business, believing it very unnecessary for me to medle or trouble my head, when the King was here . . . yet I had often melancholy thoughts upon public affairs.'

Documents until recently inaccessible reveal the fact that, after La Hogue, William saw the possibility of aiming a real blow at France in the main seat of her power. He sent instructions from Flanders early in June, 1692,[68] that the cabinet should consider sending a squadron of English and Dutch ships into the Mediterranean Sea which should be used neither for convoy

[67] Lady Rachel Russell's Letters, II. 109.

[68] Nottingham to Russell, June 11, 1692: 'Mr. Blathwayt writes . . . about sending a squadron to the Mediterranean in which the Dutch will join their quota . . . I do not see what use a squadron can be there, for we have no fleet of merchant ships there . . . and are likely to have none considerable . . . Besides the French may yet be superior to us in those seas, unless we know what they would send thither . . . 'Tis true it would be of great reputation to appear on the coast of Barbary with a squadron, and might induce these pirates to break with France, which would ruin the French trade in that sea' (Finch MSS, Public Record Office).

duty nor commerce protection. One of the most distinguished of English naval historians has said: 'Even after Russell's victory at La Hogue had given William the command, it was only used in the old way . . . It was not until the fifth year of the war that a radical change in Louis' strategy opened William's eyes to his real power. Then there was something Napoleonic in the rapidity and completeness with which he grasped the new idea and changed his front.'[69] This can now be proved to be an erroneous statement. There was to be no passage of English ships into the Mediterranean yet, however. 'The Queen was advised against sending a squadron into the Mediterranean,'[70] wrote Nottingham to Russell. The cabinet councillors, probably suspecting that William was sacrificing the immediate interests of England to the exigencies of his continental campaign, did not realise that such a step as William projected was but the logical development of English naval strategy in the seventeenth century. Command in the Mediterranean sea would not only effect a diversion of Louis' military power from Flanders, and prevent the severance of William's weaker allies, but would make England supreme as a naval power.

The Queen began her Memoirs for 1693 thus: 'When I begin to reflect on this year I am almost frighted, and dare hardly go on: for 'tis the year I have met with more troubles as to publick affairs than any other . . . The two great things wherein we were more especially concerned were both unfortunate, the losse of the Turky fleet, and of the batle in Flanders, the first foreseen and feard all along by the King, received with a sort of malicious joy by many at home, and wonderd at by all

[69] Corbett, England in the Mediterranean, II. 144-6.
[70] Finch MSS, Public Record Office.

who had no particular concerns abroad, to see so great preparations, so vast a charge, so fine a fleet, and nothing done, much honour lost as well as wealth of nation.'[71]

The loss of the Smyrna fleet was the most serious loss that England suffered in the year after La Hogue, when France directed her naval resources almost exclusively to the destruction of English and Dutch commerce. At Portsmouth on the 14th-15th May, a conference was held of six members of the cabinet, and the three Tory Admirals of the fleet. The latter gave their opinion that the Turkey fleet should not sail 'if there be no certain intelligence of the Toulon Squadron being come out of the Straits.'[72] The cabinet ministers returned to London, and on the 19th the following instructions were sent to Admiral Russell: 'In pursuance of her Majesty's pleasure, signified to this Board, you are hereby required . . . to sail with their Majesties' fleet, together with the . . . ships under the command of Sir George Rooke and the merchant ships under his convoy . . . and to keep company with the said squadron and merchant ships so far as you shall think it requisite.'[73] No certain intelligence of the movements of the French Toulon fleet had reached the councillors, yet they ordered the Turkey fleet to sail in defiance of expert naval advice!

Calm weather and difficulty in getting provisions delayed the departure of the fleet. The Queen was impatiently awaiting news of its having sailed, and instructed Secretary Trenchard to write asking 'the reason of this delay from day to day.'[74] The Admirals 'under sail' wrote to Trenchard on the 30th: 'If there is any knowledge of the enemy's fleet, we do not doubt

[71] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 56.
[72] House of Lords MSS, 1693, p. 231.
[73] Ibid.
[74] C. S. P. Dom. 1693, p. 158.

but that you will let us know it.'[75] By the 14th June full and evidently reliable information had reached the government concerning the movements of the French ships, and on the 21st Trenchard wrote to the Admirals: 'The Lords of the Council as well as the merchants are very apprehensive that the design of the French may be to intercept the Mediterranean squadron. . . . The Queen . . . commands that you take such course . . . as . . . be thought best for securing the retreat of any ships belonging to that squadron, if there be occasion.'[76] Private letters sent from London give evidence of the great anxiety with which news of the fate of the rich fleet was hourly expected. One letter concludes: 'A strange perplexed feare hath seased on most of our merchants and citezens least the French fleet should take our Turky outward bound fleet.'[77] Another says: 'Our Cabinett, Admiralty and Exchange all swett for the safety of our Turky fleet . . . computed not less worth than five millions.'[78] It may be inferred that the Queen was also filled with the most serious apprehensions. On the 9th-19th June she wrote to Sophia of Hanover: 'My misfortune makes me be here at a time none woud ever chose the town . . . At such times when I woud not losse a minit of knowing what passes beyond sea, 'tis the best place.'[79] The Queen was also perturbed at this time about the military situation in Flanders. Events were leading to the Battle of Landen (July 19-29) at which William was defeated.

[75] Ibid., p. 160. [76] Ibid., pp. 187 f.
[77] Lady Chaworth to the Earl of Rutland: Rutland MSS, III. 139; Hist. MSS. Comm. [78] Rutland MSS, III. p. 140; Hist. MSS. Comm.
[79] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 103.

Sir George Rooke with his squadron and the merchant ships parted from the main fleet on the 6th June, before Trenchard's letters of warning had reached the Admirals. About ten days later they encountered the whole of the French fleet in Lagos Bay, and about eighty of the merchantmen were lost. Rooke's squadron by favour of the night and a fair wind got away.

When news of the disaster reached London in the second week in July, the dismay and resentment of the merchants was intense. In a petition which was discussed at a meeting of the Privy Council presided over by the Queen, they begged her to 'examine from whence. . . such a dispatch of the Mediterranean fleet has arisen, which has been the occasion of so great a loss and dishonour to the Kingdom.'[80]

How did Mary express herself on the subject of this disaster? She considered that it was in great measure 'caused by the ill intelligence of those who were in business, no orders being obeyed, no faults punisht, everyone glad to lay the blame on another ... All this I saw, was vext and troubled, and much more because I could not help it. I am always apprehensive of letting myself grow angry, especially when it will signify nothing. For as long as people are to be managed and know it, they will be insolent and do what they please, believing themselves very necessary if they are a little so.'[81] If any one order was responsible for the tragedy, it was that of the 19th May, which ignored the advice of the naval commanders.[82] Mary certainly felt some responsibility, however, as is proved by a letter which she wrote some

[80] House of Lords MSS, 1693, p. 192. [81] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, pp. 59-61.
[82] No definite evidence is forthcoming as to who authorised its despatch. but a statement was later made in the House of Commons that the opinion of the Admirals was placed before the King, and that the order of the 19th was sent by his command (Cobbett, V. 783).

months afterwards to Sophia of Hanover: 'You spare the sea maters as much as you can, tho the litle you say is enough . . . one of the misfortunes of the King's long absence . . . he canot at a distance take the necessary care of so great a conserne, and a woman is but a very uselesse and helplesse creature at all times, espesiely in times of war and dificulty . . . I find by my own sad experience that an old English inclination to the love and honour of the nation signifys nothing in a womans heart without a mans head and hands. You know how the English value themselves and their honour especiely in sea matters, so that may be they wanted a little humbleing, and I think they have had it.'[83]

Bishop Burnet's comment to Sir William Trumbull on the loss of the fleet is worth recording: 'We have a gracious Queen, and a wise cabinet without a farthing of money . . . *The city is in so great disorder* that they dare not borrow . . . All out of love with their management, and no prospect for matters to mend.'[84] Contemporary opinion was against the Tory Admirals, and they were first suspended and then discharged from all civil and military employments.

During the winter of 1693-4, William did his utmost to urge forward naval preparations for the next summer's campaign, and began reforms in victualling office, docks, and yards. The disaster of 1693 had revealed to the wealthy merchants in the city the importance of the fleet, and large sums of money were lent by them for naval purposes. 'God . . . yet kept people in heart enough still to send money to support us, and supported them by the goodness of the seasons, and the fruits of the earth,' so wrote the Queen in her Memoirs.

[83] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, pp. 108f.
[84] Downshire MSS, I. 1.425; Hist. MSS Comm.

In the last year of Mary's administration occurred the long designed attack on Brest, and the appearance of the English fleet in the Mediterranean, the latter an event of very considerable importance.

The weaker Mediterranean powers were menaced in the spring by a concentration of French naval strength. Louis aimed at forcing Spain and Savoy out of the Alliance in order that he might afterwards hurl himself against the imperial and Anglo-Dutch forces. In May Palamos was beseiged, and Barcelona would be the next objective. The French fleet was already planning to coöperate with the advancing French army in Catalonia.

The departure of the French ships from Brest in May seemed to offer a good opportunity for the attack on Brest, but it was not until the 30th that Lieutenant-General Talmash sailed with his troops. At Whitehall news was eagerly awaited. Some days passed, and still nothing was heard about the attempted landing. Then a Captain Green presented himself and asked for audience of the Queen, at which none should be present but Lord Shrewsbury, then one of the Secretaries of State. It was thus that Mary heard an account of the engagement from one who had experienced its heat and its stress. General Talmash led the attacking army. As the men approached the shore, they realised that elaborate preparations had been made for their reception. 'This sudden and prodigious appearance of strength made our men not very forward to land.'[85] The General gave oral orders for landing, but few obeyed them. 'Notwithstanding the great danger, the General would and did land.'[86] He plunged

[85] C. S. P. Dom. 1694-5, p. 183. [86] Ibid.

into water up to his waist, and, followed by two or three officers, rushed for cover to a rock thirty yards from the edge of the water. He then put himself at the head of a small company and went forward, but was repelled by a volley of shots, one of which wounded him in the thigh. He again dashed forward, but was again forced back. A body of French horsemen was seen advancing to the shore, and the General yielded to entreaty and allowed himself to be lifted into a small boat. He was taken to Plymouth, but his life could not be saved. He died asserting that it was impossible to have served their Majesties better unless he had been better obeyed; none of the general officers landed with him. Mary undoubtedly listened with deep interest and sympathy to the story of the bravery of the officer whose life had been sacrificed, and she afterwards showed her usual prudence in commanding Shrewsbury to recommend to Captain Green that he should not divulge circumstances which might be construed 'to the prejudice of some of the living.'

To what may be attributed the failure of the attack on Brest? On the 1st May Louis wrote to the engineer Vauban instructing him to proceed at once to the fortification of Brest.[87] Marlborough's letter, giving important information to James, was not forwarded from England until the 3rd May.[88] Godolphin's treachery, therefore, was more probably the cause of Louis' preparedness: the Jacobite Lloyd, a report of whose mission to England was taken to Versailles on the 1st May, mentions Godolphin as the source of his information that 'Russell will infallibly appear before Brest.'[89] It is hard to believe that such

[87] Journal de l'institut Historique, V. 223.
[88] Macpherson, I. 487.
[89] Ibid., I. 483.

men as Marlborough and Godolphin were actuated entirely by principle or even partly by sentiment. Where there was not the prudent desire to keep on good terms with both sides, it was—in the words of Shrewsbury to William about Monmouth in July, 1694—'natural for a man who is very ill on one side to desire not to be so on the other.' The disaster at Brest, however, is proof enough that zeal for the Jacobite cause had not disappeared, although it is true that the victory of La Hogue in 1692 suppressed for a time the activities of organized Jacobitism. Sir James Montgomery wrote a report for King James at about the end of 1693, on the state of politics in England, from which the following extract may be given: 'Its true the Princess is popular, and well beloved amongst the people, but tho she should oppose your Majesty's restouration as formerly (as its hoped she will not if she sees the difficultys great) yet she is but a woman, and cannot be in all her kingdomes at once, nor act and travell as a man could to suppress disorders timeously. Good officers who are popular and zealous against your interest are wanting and nominall ones are not much valued.'[90]

Russell, with his sixty-three ships of the line, left the Brest Squadron in June and reached the coast of Spain at the beginning of July. Palamos had fallen, and Barcelona was being threatened by sea and by land, but he could not force the naval conflict he desired. 'I shall return without doing any service, which will be a great mortification to me.'[91]

At the beginning of August, at a meeting of the Committee, the councillors were unable to come to a decision on the question

[90] The Melvills and the Leslies, Sir W. Fraser, III. 232.
[91] C. S. P. Dom. 1694-5, p. 224.

of ordering Russell to winter in the Mediterranean. William accepted the responsibility evaded by the Queen's advisers, and on the 6-16th August sent commands for Russell to winter in Cadiz. The instructions were to be 'laid before her Majesty, for her, if she thinks fit, to approve and sign.'[92] The King had given 'positive orders' to relieve Russell from the difficulties which 'a doubtful order might expose him to.' The orders placed before the Queen for her signature differed from the King's original orders in that Russell was to return 'if extraordinary difficulties arose.'[93] Shrewsbury persuaded the Queen to sign them. She must have done so with misgivings. When William wrote again on the importance of strict and definite orders being given to Russell, she was in doubt as to the wisdom of her action in agreeing to the importunity of the councillors. She commanded the Committee once more to consider the matter, for on the 28th Shrewsbury wrote to William: 'The Queen is doubtful whether the last directions dispatched to Mr. Russell do come entirely up to your Majesty's intentions, or whether they do not leave him too much room to return. This, by her Majesty's special commands, was particularly considered by the Committee, and they are unanimously of opinion that nothing more could be sent unless orders were penned so positive as to leave him no latitude . . . to use his discretion.'[94] Confirmatory orders were sent to the Admiral by the Queen's command, however, emphasising the positive nature of the orders previously sent. And the fleet stayed on, month after month, during that long winter. The allegiance of Spain and Savoy was retained; William had some measure of success in

[92] Shrewsbury Corres., Coxe, p. 69. [93] Ibid., p. 70.
[94] C. S. P. Dom. 1694-5, p. 280.

Flanders; the French fleet suffered from the demoralisation of inertia; and diplomatic Europe began to be sensible of 'a new development in international politics.' That 'development' was in reality but the resumption of an old policy, which was abandoned with Tangiers—that seventeenth-century symbol of British imperial ambition—in 1684, and resulted in the establishment of a naval supremacy which has never since been lost.

CHAPTER FIVE

POLITICS

THE FORMATION and permanence of a government in the latter part of the seventeenth century in England did not depend principally upon the electorate, nor upon the legislature. As proof of this may be given the fact that, although the elections of 1690 returned a slight Tory majority, the government was a coalition, and further that, with the same House of Commons in 1692 there was almost a pure Tory government, which again changed two years later into one of an entirely Whig composition. The forces to which these changes may be attributed were neither simple nor few, but the dominating one was the ambition of the King. The exigencies of his campaign against France conditioned the structure of the government in England: his outlook was European and not English. William, as soon as he realised that his wife's claim to the allegiance of the Tories ensured more or less his own possession of it, gave them his favour so long as they were willing to support the necessary continuance of the war.

Although it must be admitted that the ultimate consideration that always impelled the Queen was the influence of any specified course of action on William's Great Cause, yet she was essentially a patriot, and had an intense interest in the merely domestic concerns of England which William lacked. It may be inferred from this that her personal contact with statesmen during the absences of William influenced to some extent the development of English party politics within the limits prescribed by the needs of foreign policy.

The Queen's influence on politics during the first period of her administration in the summer of 1690 may best be revealed by a study of her relations with the Whig members of her cabinet. She has left a record of her conversations with Lord Monmouth, the Duke of Devonshire, and Mr. Russell, in which her Tory bias is clearly discernible. The Whigs undoubtedly regarded the absence of William as providing an opportunity for the furtherance of party designs. The political situation was intricate enough, and the Queen entirely without experience. Carmarthen and Nottingham, however, the Tory ministers in whom she confided most, were zealous in the Tory interest, making it no easy matter for the other members of the cabinet to discuss politics alone with the Queen. There is at least one instance of a timely entrance on the part of Nottingham, which relieved her from the importunity of two Whig statesmen who had abruptly left the Privy Council to seek her. The official Whig plan was to secure a dissolution of Parliament; and the first step was to arouse suspicions of disloyalty against the Tories in office. 'Lemon letters' were intercepted, which recorded, ostensibly for the use of Jacobites, the business transacted in the cabinet. In the absence of Monmouth the dispatch of these letters ceased. Mary in one of her many letters to William related that Monmouth had regretted to her the misfortune of seeing things 'go so ill,' which was certainly due to the fault of those in trust: 'he began to talk high of ill administration.' Mary's indignant reply was that they had already removed Lord Halifax; the same endeavours were used for Lord Carmarthen, and would they now begin to have a bout at Lord Nottingham, too? She was obviously on the defensive in the Tory interest.

On the 14th July came the definite offer to Mary from Monmouth of £200,000 'upon a note under my hand' on condition that Parliament should be dissolved. The Queen fully realised the political importance of the move; she regarded it as 'of that consequence' that even if the Lords of the Great Council passed a unanimous vote upon it, she would not consent until she had received authority from William. 'Unless they would lend me some money (which is really most extreamly wanted) upon other terms, I must go without it.'[1]

Soon afterwards another Whig member of the Council assured Mary of what 'she had heard often within these few days,' that she had the power in her own hands; 'they wonder I will not make use of it.' He questioned also the wisdom of losing time by waiting for William's decisions on important questions. Lord Devonshire, 'a courtier among ladies,' next began to lay siege to the citadel. 'We fell into a discourse of the divisions which both lamented . . . and he complained that people were too much believed that ought not to be so . . . we could not agree.'[2] On the 7th August there was 'a great dispute,' on the question of calling a new Parliament: 'They would have me do it, but that I think improper for me . . . 'Tis certain that party have done all they could to hinder money coming in . . . I find I am like to hear a great deal of this matter.'[3] Five days later Lord Devonshire suggested to the Queen in a 'long conversation' that she should write to William asking him to consider the dissolution of the Tory Parliament: 'This he is sure will do no good . . . I see it is a thing they are mightily set upon.' Mary had obviously made it clear to the Whig politicians that she

[1] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. 11, p. 141. [2] Ibid., p. 149.
[3] Ibid., p. 157.

would resist any attempt to force her to action independent of her husband in this important matter.

But she realised fully the need of adopting a gracious and friendly attitude towards the Whigs. Admiral Russell did not seek her presence until through his relative, Lady Rachel Russell, Mary expressed her desire to see him. She referred, in her subsequent conversation with him, to her fear of being 'too much led or persuaded by one party.' He was glad to find her of that mind, and promised to wait upon her when he saw occasion. She always 'took pains' to talk to Lord Shrewsbury, when he appeared at Court.

A member of an important Whig family, Mr. Goodwin Wharton, Member of Parliament for Malmesbury, and Privy Councillor, was in the habit of visiting the Queen during the summer months of 1690. An account of what took place at one of these visits may best be given in his own words. Mr. Wharton records that it was in obedience to the divine command that he sought audience of the Queen. 'Now the Lord said, My Son, My Son, I say to thee, I'd faine have ye to-morrow the Queen's face see . . I went then to Whitehall, and having an information out of Council of moment, sent to speak with her before Sermon . . . but I could not . . . The next morning I went again and she sent me word if I would speak with her alone, I should come between two and three . . . When I came . . . she met me, and beginning with my information, I exorted her not to follow arbitrary Councells, and advised her to put out my Lord Nottingham, the only Secretary; our discourse was pleasant enough, but I perceived her under a very great concern, yet seemed to yield to what I said with all the complaisance she could . . . Fearing the interview might be censured as too long, she closed

the discourse, and thanking me, withdrew.' Mr. Goodwin Wharton persevered, however, and again was honoured by her Majesty. 'I began first to make her own the secret hand of Providence governed all things, which, being confest, I said I would tell her how she came to be Queen. This startled her, and she was afraid to hear reflections . . . but she . . . heard very patiently pressing me to go on, which I did . . . in general heads, omitting only the other Queen's concern and the fighting business, and then I pressed to leave off, and she consented to leave it to the next walking.' Within a few days, the gentleman was again with the Queen 'who was extraordinarily kind, doing all she could to oblige me, going right over the leads at Whitehall on purpose to show it the more,'[4] but the conversation about the circumstances of the Revolution was never resumed, opportunities being hard and she fearful of being taken notice of . . . She fails of no opportunity of showing her friendship.'

At the time when the Queen was listening with graciousness to Whig disparagement of her councillors from the one brother, the other, Mr. Comptroller Wharton, was keeping himself in touch with certain important matters by frequent correspondence with Sir Thomas Lee, one of the Admiralty Commissioners. The cabinet at the end of July was discussing the appointment of an Admiral to succeed Lord Torrington. The first result of their deliberations was the decision that the office should be held in commission by a 'person of quality' and 'two seamen,' —Haddick and Ashby. The 'person of quality' might be either Russell or Pembroke. Then came William's orders through the Queen that Russell was to command the fleet with Haddick under him. The Admiral refused the office, saying to her Majesty

[4] Autobiography of Goodwin Wharton, Brit. Mus. Add., 20,006-7.

that not only the eye and expectation of all England, but of all Europe and especially of Holland was upon that choice, and he did not think there was a man in England capable of doing it alone; his opinion was that the command should be in a commission of at least three, with either Pembroke or Shrewsbury as the person of quality. Mary thereupon desired Nottingham to discover the attitude of Pembroke, and was later told that he also refused the responsibility. Carmarthen then proffered his services to the Queen. She 'put that off with compliments,' and, knowing that it was William's wish, if Russell would not act, named the two seamen, leaving the third member of the commission to William's nomination. After the cabinet meeting at which this was decided, Mary found awaiting her all the Commissioners of the Admiralty, except Mr. Russell and Captain Priestman. The Commissioners themselves had met on the same day for the purpose of nominating an Admiral, and when they were notified of the decision arrived at by the Queen and cabinet, they were indignant at what they regarded as an invasion of their privilege, and resolved to place before the King their claim to the responsibility of issuing the commission, and at once to represent to the Queen that it was best for the King's service that Mr. Russell should have sole command of the fleet. Lee wrote thus to Thomas Wharton on the 22nd July: 'We . . . this night did propose to name an Admiral for the fleet, upon which we had a report from the Queene that its the King's pleasure that the fleet be commanded by a commission. . . . Upon this it was said the Counsell must needs make this proposall to the King that the board were to be answerable for their commition.' When face to face with the Queen, Sir Thomas Lee earnestly pleaded that Russell should have sole command,

and displayed a strong dislike of the Tory Haddick. Mary's response was that William had sent explicit instructions, and to apply to him again after he had 'writ his mind' so plainly, was loss of time, but the Commissioners were not satisfied. It was 'late when they went,' and Mary ordered Nottingham to call an extraordinary meeting of the Committee for the following day. The Councillors having assembled, the Queen asked Pembroke to relate what had occurred the night before, that she 'might have the advice of the Lords . . . I saw none thought there could be any change made.'[5] The Commissioners of the Admiralty were desired to dispatch the Commission to Haddick and Ashby, and informed that ultimately another Commissioner would be named. Sir Thomas Lee, 'as pale as death,' exclaimed that as they were to issue the Commissions, Parliament might hold them responsible for the persons chosen, and peaded that it was the custom for the Admiralty to have the privilege of recommending naval commanders. Lee finished by declaring emphatically that 'it cannot be: her Majesty may give the Commission if she pleases; we cannot.'—'He talked long and insisted on their privilege,'[6] so Mary reported to William. The cabinet abided by their decision, and three of the Commissioners later sent an excuse by the Lord President to the Queen for not signing the Commissions.

On the next day two Whig members of the cabinet, Russell and Devonshire, separately sought to explain to the Queen the motives that were actuating Lee and his colleagues. The former said that Haddick was not acceptable to the Admiralty Commissioners because they thought Nottingham had recommended him, and Devonshire excused them on the ground that they

[5] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. 11, p. 147. [6] Ibid.

thought the appointment was a concerted thing, 'done by two or three.' To this Mary responded: 'You should have assured Sir Thomas Lee that it was the King's order expressed in his letter to me.' Lord Devonshire shook his head. 'Do you or Sir Thomas not believe me?' 'Sir Thomas thought that Haddick had been imposed on the King.' 'I do not believe that would be so easy!' Lord Devonshire: 'I mean—recommended by persons they do not much like.' 'Indeed, if they only dislike Haddick because he is recommended by such as they don't approve, it will confirm me in the belief that he is a fit man, since they can make no other objection against him. I confess I was very angry at what Sir Thomas Lee said yesterday, but this is to make me more so, since I see 'tis not reason but passion makes Sir Thomas Lee speak thus!'[7] Mary was not far wrong in her conclusion. Conditioning that assertion of privilege was the bitter animus of the Whigs against Nottingham and the Tory party. But the Whigs did not have their way; the Commissions for Ashby, Haddick, and Killigrew were signed on the 7th August by the Admiralty in accordance with William's orders, although three of the seven members refused their signatures, including, as might be expected, Sir Thomas Lee. The Queen reveals in her handling of this episode a quickness of apprehension and an insight into fundamental issues which were remarkable in one so inexperienced in public affairs. She also betrayed, in addition to her unfailing loyalty to William, a distrust of the Whig party which she never lost.

Had the Queen any influence on the transition to a Tory government which had occurred by 1692? Few facts can be adduced to prove it. In 1691 Mary records that she saw 'all

[7] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. II, p. 149.

those I was to trust together by the ears, and a general peevishness and sylleness in them all, except Lord Sidney . . . I was told the King and I were less loved, that we had many enemies and no friends.'[8] She may have felt the need of support, in the absence of the King, of one of her own blood. Rochester and Ranelagh entered the Privy Council in March, 1692, and Seymour became a Commissioner of the Treasury. Since the summer of 1689, when the Queen had first approached William on the subject of introducing Rochester into business, she had become even more friendly with her uncle, and he and Lord Ranelagh were related by marriage. When the enmity that existed between Carmarthen and Rochester is considered, it becomes apparent that an influence greater than that of the Lord President must have effected Rochester's entrance into the cabinet, which occurred also in 1692. It should be stated, however, that Rochester and Seymour had identified themselves with the adverse criticisms expressed in the House of the naval administration of Nottingham and Carmarthen in 1691, and Burnet may be right in stating that this promotion was due to the necessity of conciliating the opposition. Various causes may operate to effect the same end: it cannot be said with certainty that the Queen exerted no influence on these events.

Godolphin, though really a non-party politician, was at that time working with the Tories. A spectator has left a record of his friendly relationships with the Queen in 1691. During June and July they were often seen in conversation at Whitehall. Upon one occasion they were together for nearly half an hour, surrounded by a large crowd. It was remarked by a spectator that he laughed two or three times—'ce qui ne lui arrive guere.'[9]

[8] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 36.
[9] Hist. MSS Comm., App. to 7th Rep., Denbigh MSS, p. 200.

Lord Shrewsbury was also present, and it was observed that he had lost the honour of speaking of affairs of state with the Queen, 'et qu'il se tient à la porte du conseil du cabinet avec tout sort de gens pendant que celui à qui il a bien voulu quiter sa place est non seulement dedans mais qu'il fait la pluspart des affaires surtout pendant l'absence de my Lord Président comme à present.'[10] The disgrace of Marlborough in 1692 involved Shrewsbury's resignation from the Privy Council. Carmarthen and Nottingham, with Rochester and Godolphin, were then predominant in the councils of the Queen.

But the Whig opposition was gathering together its forces. The first result of the concentration was the downfall of Nottingham in November, 1693. The session of 1692-3 was very stormy. The Place Bill of December, 1692, although it did not become law, was a direct attack upon the government and the royal prerogative. The Queen wrote at the end of the year, however: 'Notwithstanding all the oppositions endeavoured in Parliament . . . things seem to go on well.'[11] In the following January, Shrewsbury introduced the Triennial Bill, the chief aim of which was to cause the dissolution of the sitting Parliament. This was defeated only by the use of the royal veto. These attacks on the prerogative became even more clamorous, and they, with opposition criticism of naval administration in 1692, forced William upon his return in November, to dismiss Nottingham. The Queen remarks on this: 'At his coming all the world was almost despairing; himself thought his cause was so bad that he was forced to part with Lord Nottingham to please a party who he cannot trust . . . 'Twas impossible to help hearing what past every day in both Houses. I saw parties so much

[10] Ibid. [11] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 44.

increase, and a kind of affectation to do all that was insolent to the King without fear of punishment that he could not govern his own servants, nay that he durst not punish them, but was obliged to keep those in his service who least deserved it . . . yet hitherto things go pretty well, the triennal bill thrown out so as not to be brought in again this session . . . everyone resolved to try one more year at least.'[12]

It is not difficult to see that Mary's sympathies were entirely on the Tory side. She always betrayed indignation at any attempt to limit the King's prerogative: how far the acts which provoked her resentment presented themselves to her mind merely as personal affronts to her husband, it is difficult to judge. There is no evidence that she possessed well-reasoned political ideas to which Whig theories were in opposition. When Monmouth discussed the administration with her in the summer of 1690, she told him that she found it very strange that the King was not thought fit to choose his own ministers; the Whigs pretended ever to control the King in his choice, which she would not suffer if she were in his place, but would make use of whom she pleased. In her verbal contests with Sir Thomas Lee on the nomination of an Admiral, she said that she perceived the King had given away his own power, and could not make an Admiral which the Admiralty did not like, and at Lee's response, 'No, no more he can't!' she was 'heartily angry.'[13]

In one sense only may it be said that Mary exerted any favourable influence on the Whig cause, and that was in her nominations to the episcopate. Between February, 1689, and December, 1691, there were eighteen episcopal appointments,

[12] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, pp. 58-61.
[13] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. II, pp. 147 f.

three only of which were transferences from other sees. When it is realised that there were only twenty-six sees, and that the new Bishops were all latitudinarians and therefore Whigs, it will be observed that a very remarkable change was effected in the composition of the episcopal bench. Considerations other than those of party politics, however, determined the Queen in assisting in the choice of new bishops,—but this subject is dealt with in another chapter. It may be said in passing that the actual influence of the bishops in the Upper House was necessarily very limited, for the temporal peers were in a substantial majority, numbering about one hundred and sixty.

At that time parliamentary privilege was pleaded by peers as a means of evading the payment of debts, and their immunity was often communicated to their servants. The case of a foreign ambassador claiming a similar privilege for himself and his servant was brought before the Queen in May, 1691. One of the servants of the Spanish ambassador, Ronquillo, was arrested for debt. The ambassador 'a pris si fort à coeur que le conseil Privé, ou pour mieux dire Nottingham, ne le vouloit pas faire sortir par autorité en égard à son privilege, qu'il est sorti de son lit malade à une lieue d'ici s'est fait porter à Witehall chez la Reyne pour lui faire ses plaintes comme en pleurant de rage. La Reyne l'a fort contente par ses manières obligeantes.'[14] Her Majesty then sent for Danby, whom Ronquillo greeted with reproaches. The Lord President responded, 'sans l'emouvoir,' that he was quite willing to sign a warrant to free the servant but that a majority of the councillors was opposed to it, 'surtout My Lord Nottingham et les gens de robe.' The Queen at once asked for Lord Nottingham, but he could not be found.

[14] Hist. MSS Comm., App. to 7th Rep., Denbigh MSS, p. 197.

She then caused an order to be made preventing the prisoner from being taken to the public prison from the house of the constable. With this the Spanish ambassador was 'assez content.' At a subsequent meeting of the cabinet, 'où étoit la Reyne,' the Attorney General was ordered to deal with the question of the privilege of ambassadors in such a way that Ronquillo was quite satisfied. 'On a fait conoitre à l'ambassadeur qu'il feroit bien de ne pas écrire à la Cour d'espagne sur ce sujet jusques à ce qu'on lui ait rendu la justice qu'il demand.'[15] A few months after this, Ronquillo died. Is it to be attributed to diplomatic considerations or to the Queen's humanity, that she made provision for his household until they could hear from Spain? 'The Queen has ordered 5/- a day to the better sort of the late Spanish Ambassador's servants, and 2/6d for the rest. The whole number is about 30, and they will take lodging somewhere within the limits of the court . . . Without it, they must have starved;' so Nottingham wrote to Sidney in August, 1691.[16] Another observer records that a certain Comte de Windisgrats 'fait des eloges sur cela qu'elle merite bien.'

Mary has left few references in her Memoirs which reveal her ideas on the subject of political morality. She did not allow the dictates of a sensitive conscience to prevent her offering money to secure the alliance of a foreign power. In April, 1692, Nottingham wrote to a 'Consul Baker' that the Queen, having been informed that the Algerines might be prevailed upon to break with France if some presents were made to the 'great men' of that government, 'Her Majesty dos very well approve of this condition, and would willingly be at that charge, and

[15] Ibid., p. 198. [16] Finch MSS, Public Record Office.

therefore . . . commands me to tell you that if you find the great men there will be persuaded by such an offer to engage Algiers in a war with France, and that they can effect it, her Majesty will allow that sum.'[17] In spite of this, it may be said with truth that, although Mary did not transcend the best conception of her own time of the ethical principles that should govern the organisation of social and political life, she always did her utmost to express in action the highest ideals she knew. There were occasions, however, when she had to acquiesce in methods of attaining political ends of which her conscience disapproved. Such an occasion occurred in 1693.

William was anxious to secure the inclusion of the Elector of Saxony in the Grand Alliance, and at the beginning of that year sent Sir William Colt to Dresden to effect this, although it meant bribing the Elector's mistress, Madame de Rocklitz, and her mother. The ministers of all the Allies found it necessary to make a joint offer to enlist the services of these women on the Protestant side. By the 10th May, Colt had succeeded in his design; the Elector definitively joined the Allies, and afterwards served with distinction on the Rhine. The child who was later born to Madame de Rocklitz, then a countess in her own right, was sponsored by William and Mary, and received the name Wilhelmine Marie Frederike. Mary refers to this diplomatic episode in a letter to Sophia of Hanover on the 26th September thus: 'Sir William Colt did not think me so nice . . . it seems upon those maters . . . I durst not publikly disown what he did. I am a very ill politician and shoud never have thought of gaining the Elector of Saxe that way, which I heer is the only way to do it, but I was bid hold my tongue, and not losse him

[17] Ibid.

by my scruples. I think ministers have some latitude alowd them, and must not stand so much upon things which other honest men must scruple, a little equivocation is dispensed with in them by all religions.'[18] She referred to the intervening death of Sir William Colt, which prevented her giving herself the only satisfaction that was possible, that of reproaching him.

There was to be 'one more year at least.' William's capitulation to the Whigs made it possible for him to continue the war. Russell was restored to the Admiralty, Shrewsbury in March, 1694, became Secretary, and within a month Seymour was dismissed from the Treasury. The only tie that connected Nottingham with the Court was the fact that his wife still retained her position as lady-in-waiting to the Queen.

William had expressed displeasure at the result of Mary's administration in 1693, but this cannot be assigned as the reason there was no formal cabinet during the summer of 1694. The conduct of affairs was then left in the hands of the chief officials of the crown, who were to meet together as they thought necessary to make decisions, which were then to be placed before the Queen for approval.

From the first year of the Queen's administration, bitter opposition was expressed to the usurpation by the cabinet of the power of the Privy Council. This expressed itself by the demand, in July, 1690, for the presence of Mary at the meetings of the Privy Council. Upon one occasion the members refused to speak but before the Queen: they were 'Privy Councillors *established by law*,' and did not know why they should be refused her presence. On the same day, in the words of the Queen, 'Lord Lincoln sat in the gallery crying that five or six lords shut

[18] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 106.

me up and would let nobody else come near me.'[19] The opposition to that extra-legal body, the cabinet, was not confined to members of the Privy Council. In the Commons at the end of November, 1692, was a heated debate on the subject: an extract from one speech then made will give an understanding of its nature. Mr Goodwin Wharton: 'Those cabinet councils have drawn the King into error; I should thinke that in the Commission of the Admiralty there should be some experienced men in maritime affaires, and there is but one Secretary of state, the general part of the government lyes there. He that will be Secretary ought to bee generous and Brave . . . ought to regard the public above private considerations, and must not starve the cause . . . All is done at the cabinet. There are no records or papers to know what they do, and it is hard to know their names: I would have the Privy Council advised with and put their hands to their advice or dissent.'[20] The attack on Nottingham, although significant, is of less interest than the obvious distrust of the cabinet.

In a discussion on the Bill of Indemnity by a Committee of the Whole House on the 5th December, 1692, occurs the following resolution: 'The Committee is of opinion that the powers given by this Act shall not be executed but by *the whole Privy Council.*'[21] The resolution did not pass, but it should be noted as indicative of the feeling of the House. In March, 1694, the Commons made a 'Humble Representation to his Majesty in which reference is made to the withholding of royal assent to Bills 'by insinuations of particular persons, without the advice of the Privy Council.' His Majesty is begged not to hearken to 'the secret advices of particular persons, who may have

[19] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. 2, p. 137. [20] Bodl. Carte MSS, 130 f. 339.
[21] House of Lords MSS, 1692-3, p. 126.

private interests of their own.'[22] These extracts supply some reasons for William's declaration that there should be no cabinet council for 1694. Another reason may have been that William wished to avoid the difficulty of deciding who were to be cabinet ministers. If no councillors were named, Mary could consult whom she wished, and could omit to consult people like Normanby, who had inconvenient claims. It this were so, William's action was calculated to give Mary greater freedom and initiative.

The officials who were consulted by the King during the Spring of 1694 numbered about ten, and the notes of the business transacted at their meetings were called 'Privy Council Minutes,' with the exception that on the 21st June, 1694, the minutes were endorsed 'Cabinet Council at Whitehall.' There was actually during that summer no cabinet council in name, but there was this body of ill-defined membership which performed its usual functions. After the King's departure at the beginning of May, the number of officials who met for consultation fell to five or six. During August it varied from five to nine, but in December was only four. The Queen was never present at these meetings: it may have been that the presence of the sovereign was one of the distinguishing marks of the Cabinet Council, or perhaps her health was giving way under the strain of the past five years. From the beginning of June until the end of August, she attended only three of the eighteen meetings of the Privy Council that were held. In the corresponding months of 1693 she was present at seven of the seventeen meetings held, in 1692 at nine of the nineteen meetings, in 1691 at six of the fifteen meetings, and in 1690, at sixteen out of thirty-

[22] C. S. P. Dom. 1694-5, p. 82.

four meetings. Evidence is strong that in 1694 she was less in touch with affairs than in preceding years. If this was not owing to failing health, it was made necessary by the change in the political situation, but as her Memoirs end with the year 1693, no certain information on the subject is available.

Mary's activities in her cabinet are illustrated in every chapter of this work. Certain other cases may be referred to as proof that her influence was definite and well-recognised, and that important decisions were never made until she had been consulted. One event that proves her opinion was sought by the cabinet, and which also proves her desire to preserve the integrity of engagements with foreign powers, occurred in the summer of 1691. A Spanish ship, laden with wines, and bound for Ireland, was driven to the Isle of Man by stress of weather, and there seized as belonging to France. Mary commanded Nottingham to write to the Governor of the Island ordering its immediate release: 'Her Majesty is the more concerned to see the parties relieved herein in regard to the strict union and friendship at this time between us and Spain, and the benefit which accrues to this nation by the Spanish trade, which may be liable to suffer much by such an example as this, if not timely redressed.'[23] Lord Derby, the Governor, replied that he had good reason to believe that the ship was French. 'All I would, with all humility, beg of her Majesty, is that this strict order . . . be dispensed with' until further investigations had been made. Nottingham did not acknowledge this letter for some days. 'I had sooner returned you an answer, but that I was willing to acquaint the Queen with what your Lordship writ, and receive her directions . . . Upon consideration of the treaty

[23] Hist. MSS Comm., Kenyon MSS, p. 253.

with Spain, and the strict obligations of complying with it, her Majesty directed the immediate release of this ship, and I am now commanded to acquaint you that her Majesty sees no reason to recede from her former orders.'[24]

In the discussions that followed Preston's disclosures, when it was realised that there was one witness only against Lord Dartmouth and others, and the proposal was made that they should be prosecuted for misdemeanour as was Hampden in the late reign, Mary, after having taken advice of the Judges, who were by no means unanimous, did not 'think it adviseable to revive a method of prosecution which in the late reign was looked upon as odious, though the then judges called it legal.'[25] In accordance with Nottingham's suggestion that it might be 'prudent to seize and commit them,' which legally was possible, a warrant was taken to Dartmouth's house on the 12th July. On the following day he was in London; 'the Queen had ordered a cabinet meeting to be called' and he was to be sent for in the evening. 'The Queen came late from Summerset House,' and the meeting was accordingly delayed. Dartmouth was interviewed on the 14th in the 'cabinet council room' by the Lord President and four other lords. After Dartmouth had answered certain questions, the 'Lord President told the members of the board that they must go to the Queen before they could say anything more to him . . . Then I desired their Lordships that they would please represent me to her Majesty as favourably as I hoped . . . they might think I deserved . . . The Lord President directed me to stay until they had spoken with her Majesty . . . I was told her Majesty went late to chapel, so that the Lords could not have an opportunity of speaking until

[24] Ibid., pp. 254 f. [25] Dalrymple, II, App. 2, pp. 186 f.

after dinner . . . My Lord Nottingham did not return to me until near two o'clock, and then he told me that the Lords had all very fairly represented me to her Majesty.'[26] A warrant for sending Dartmouth to the Tower, however, was signed on the 31st July. He died there in the following October.

It would be a mistake to suppose that the Queen's direct influence ceased during 1694. The correspondence of Shrewsbury with the King contains many references to her Majesty, which prove that the chief officials were in constant touch with her. When the 'Committee' met for discussion on the subject of Russell's being instructed to winter in the Mediterranean, they 'were unanimous in no one thing as much as resolving to give no judgment . . . The Queen did me the honour to send for me, and chid me saying that in so important and nice a point, I ought not only to give your Majesty an account of my own thoughts but . . . collect the thoughts of the whole committee . . . Everyone agreed the decision ought to be left to Mr. Russell.'[27] At the request of the Queen, the cabinet, for actually it was such, gave an opinion of itself as a unitary body. There was of course no theory of 'collective responsibility' in the mind of the Queen; she merely saw the practical need of forcing the councillors to express themselves on a matter of urgent importance. Many of the political and administrative difficulties with which Mary had to contend were caused—in the words of Anson—by the lack of insistence 'on the responsibility of individuals for specific branches of state affairs, and of these individuals as a body for the actions of one another, and the policy of the whole.'[28]

[26] Hist. MSS Comm., Dartmouth MSS, pp. 285-90.
[27] Trevor's Life of William III, App. p. 476.
[28] Foxcroft's Life of Halifax, II. 208.

What estimate may be made of the Queen's ability in the conduct of affairs? Dr. Hooper, the Dean of Canterbury, was often heard to say that 'had it pleased God to have suffer'd her to survive the King . . . she would have eclipsed the glory of Queen Elizabeth, and shewn her capacity was equal to any of the greatest of her predecessors.' Mr. Pelham, one of Dr. Hooper's pupils, was 'a great admirer of King William . . . but Dr. Hooper would never allow any comparison to be made between his abilitys and those of his mistresse, which he assured him far surpassed anything in the King . . . The first year the King went to Holland convinced Mr. Pelham, who was then one of the Lords of the Treasury, how superior her understanding was, who very ingenuously came to Dr. Hooper . . . to acknowledge that he had been in the wrong, saying that she had so clear an understanding, and quick conception in all business that she was immediately mistresse of it, so as presently to dispatch them, and there was no need of attendance which they had always been used to.'[29] Such a comparison between husband and wife is invidious, but we remember that remark of Lord Halifax with regard to William: 'His thought is like a plant that is quick growing and slow in ripening.'[30] It may be true to say that what Mary lacked in depth and range of mind, she compensated for by swift apprehension, clear insight, and prodigious industry.

[29] Hill-Trevor, Life of William III, Appendix, p. 478.
[30] Foxcroft's Life of Halifax, II. 208.

CHAPTER SIX

ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS

ANGLICAN divines had long looked to the time when Mary would become 'the kind mother' of the Church of England.[1] The need of securing the permanent safety of Protestantism had justified in her mind the events of the Revolution, and it was therefore to be expected that she would especially concern herself with ecclesiastical affairs; but her direct influence was not at once apparent. She had first to prove her capacity before her imperious consort deemed it safe to allow her 'to meddle.' In a conversation with Halifax in May, 1690, William declared that Mary should give no bishoprics during his absence in Ireland.[2] In 1693, according to Burnet, 'William took no notice of the clergy and seemed to have little interest in ecclesiastical affairs.'[3] He had no power to resist importunities, and had given preferments in the church which he regretted; he was therefore prepared to leave such matters 'wholly in the Queen's hands.' Are we to suppose from this that until 1693 Mary exercised no influence of any kind on religion in England?

During 1689, when the settlement of religion was exciting furious political controversy, there are few facts to record of the Queen's activities, but certain inferences are possible. She realised that the stability of the new régime depended chiefly upon the relations of the leading ecclesiastics and statesmen with the King, and with a self-effacement that was deliberate

[1] See correspondence between Mary's chaplains and the Bishop of London, from 1683 (Bod. Rawl. C. ff. 97, 101, 123).

[2] Foxcroft's Life of Halifax, II. 251.

[3] History of My Own Times, Burnet, IV. 211.

strove to interpret her calvinistic Dutch husband favourably to Anglican churchmen. Although in the first years she did not officially nominate candidates for bishoprics, the new bishops invariably sought an audience of the Queen upon preferment. Burnet remarks upon the good advice given to him and his wife by Mary after his elevation to the See of Salisbury in March, 1689; and Patrick, in his relation of the circumstances which attended his appointment to the See of Chichester in the following September, refers to an audience of the Queen at which she told him that 'she was sure it was the King's great affection to the Church of England which moved him to choose such good men . . . to be bishops.'[4]

William in Holland had sometimes attended Anglican services as an act of courtesy to his wife. He had no understanding of, or sympathy for, any party in the English Church which showed intolerance of dissenting bodies, and therefore he regarded most favourably theologians of the liberal-latitudinarian school. What his attitude to the English Church was to be, however, did not clearly emerge until the second half of 1689. His conversations with Lord Halifax mark the progress of a very curious transition, on the religious aspect of which the Queen may have had some influence. William's proposal in March to abolish the Test Act gave great alarm to Anglicans. At the end of May he told Halifax that he approved keeping the bishoprics that should fall into his hands 'vacant for sometime,'[5]—a pernicious practice in the eyes of all zealous churchmen. A few days later he discussed a report of intrigue against him on the part of the 'church party,' and 'was then farre from leaning towards them.'[6]

[4] Works of Bishop Simon Patrick, IX. 521.
[5] Foxcroft's Life of Halifax, II. 218. [6] Ibid., pp. 218 f.

By the 3rd July, he had come to the conclusion that he would dispose of bishoprics which would fall naturally, but not of those which should fall upon the refusal of the oaths. A month later Halifax noticed 'the first turn in the King's mind about the dissenters,' and that he seemed 'to be coming over to the Church party.'[7] On the 11th August William said 'it was to be considered whether he might rely upon the Church party,' and at the end of the month decided to give the Bishopric of Worcester to Dr. Stillingfleet, whose succession to the primacy he opposed in 1694 because the Whigs thought 'his notions too high.'[8] The emphasis of William's thought was undoubtedly upon political considerations, and the change in his attitude after the middle of 1689 has been attributed mainly to the blunders of the Whigs, but may not some responsibility be reasonably assigned to the Queen, herself a 'natural' Tory and an ardent Church of England woman?

The political aspect of the ecclesiastical settlement must be briefly referred to. The bills concerning the new oaths of supremacy and allegiance were passed early in February, and the beginning of the non-juror schism was near. The toleration bill, exempting Protestant dissenters from some of the provisions of the penal statutes, speedily became law. The bill for comprehending Presbyterians, which was regarded with hostility by a large section of the church party, was referred to Convocation, and this implied its abandonment. At the suggestion of Tillotson, however, letters patent were issued in September for a purely ecclesiastical commission to meet for the preparation of a scheme of conciliatory reform to be later placed

[7] Foxcroft's Life of Halifax, II. 228.
[8] Burnet's History of My Own Times, IV. 244.

before Convocation, which was to begin to sit on the 30th November. It but remains to be said that members of Convocation dispersed at the dissolution of Parliament in February, 1690, having effected nothing, owing to High Church opposition, and the fear of the King's influence in favour of dissent. Presbyterianism in Scotland was being supported by William, chiefly because the Episcopalian clergy were nearly all Jacobite: not one bishop there took the oaths. Mary records in her Memoirs her mortification at seeing the Convocation go so ill.'[9] This is the only evidence that remains of the Queen's interest in the ecclesiastical controversies of the year.

The new oaths were to be tendered by the 1st August. Sancroft, with four bishops and about four hundred clergy, refused them; he was allowed to remain at Lambeth, although he was suspended from the exercise of his archiepiscopal functions. On the 1st February he and the bishops were deprived. Then appears the first trace of the Queen's influence. Late in the summer of 1690 Burnet, 'by the Queen's order,' conveyed a message to the Earl of Rochester and Sir John Trevor, asking them to discover whether, if an act of parliament could be obtained excusing the prelates from taking the oaths, they would be willing to perform their functions as formerly and to assist at public worship. Their response shall be given in the words of the non-juror Dr. Hickes: 'They would answer nothing and promise nothing . . . Their constancy appears in that the victory of the Boyne had no operation upon them . . . wise in not answering such insidious questions but by a prudent silence as significant and loud as any vocal answer to let that unfortunate Princess and all the world know they scorned the base-

[9] Memoirs of Mary, ed. Doebner, p. 18.

ness of her proposal, which was made to tempt them to contradict themselves in praying to those new sovereigns to whom they could not swear.'[10] This is not a fair statement of the Queen's motives. It was not until May that a successor to Sancroft was appointed, and he received an order from the Queen to quit the palace at Lambeth.

The severe action taken by Mary against the non-juring bishops in 1691 was due to the fear that some of them were engaging in conspiracy. At the beginning of the year came the discovery of the Preston plot, in which the Bishop of Ely was involved. The Queen probably saw the letter in which the Bishop assured her father of the support of 'his elder brother and the rest of the family.'[11]

The non-juror, Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells, who had been chaplain to Mary in Holland, was distinguished for loftiness of mind, spiritual insight, and sanctity of life. Mary doubtless owed much to his personal influence, and it may have been due to her that he and Frampton of Gloucester enjoyed a greater freedom than was granted to other non-juring prelates. Ken forfeited his see in February, 1690, and William Beveridge was nominated as his successor in May, 1691. His theological opinions make it impossible to believe that his nomination was due to any suggestion from the King. He refused to succeed Ken, however, and Mary then signed a *conge d'éliré* for the erection of Kidder to the vacant see. Tillotson sent him a letter which 'was to let me know from the Queen's direction that I was nominated to the bishopric of Bath and Wells, and . . . the Earl [of Nottingham] said I must not refuse it . . . After some days I returned my answer . . . that unless her Majesty

[10] Bodl. Rawl. D 841, p. 59. [11] Bodl. Tanner, 27 ff. 235, 74, and 155.

would excuse me and think of some other person, I would accept.'[12]

Although Ken never engaged in political conspiracy, he made one very determined attempt to intercede with the Queen on behalf of her father, and to make her realise the enormity of her act in usurping his throne. The letters are extant which he wrote at the end of April, 1692, to Mary and Madam Jessen, one of the Queen's ladies, who had been of the household with Ken in Holland. Madam Jessen, after having visited Ken, probably at Bath, had evidently written to him. 'I cannot visit you in the place where you are, and where all things are strange to me. The inclosed is directed to yourselfe, but chiefly designed for your Royall Mistris whome I cannot approach but by yourselfe . . . I conjure you to show it to Her . . . I shall incessantly pray to God deeply to impress on your Mistresses heart, what my Zeal . . . has prompted me to utter.'[13] It will be remembered that during this month preparations were being made to resist the expected invasion of James. The hopes of his adherents in England ran high, and James assumed the tone of one assured of victory, publishing a declaration from La Hogue announcing that he was about to assert his rights, and offering a general pardon to all who would submit, with certain important exceptions. The letter for Mary's eyes which Ken enclosed reveals not only much that is significant of the Bishop's own character, but also the affectionate esteem with which he regarded the Queen. 'If my service is in any way acceptable to your Excellent Mistris (for such she is in her nature and unblended disposition) I entreat you to lay it at her feet . . . She will find at long run, that those very persons who pretend the

[12] Bowle's Life of Ken, II. 213 f. [13] Plumptre's Life of Ken, II. 304-9.

most reall concerne for her service, will at the first appearance of danger, wholly abandon her.'[14] On the next day Ken was to leave town, and he awaited impatiently a response to this letter, but in vain. He then doubted whether Madam Jessen had had courage sufficient to perform the task of placing before the Queen a letter on so delicate a matter which had been previously opened and read by herself. Thinking thus, Ken resolved to address a letter direct to her Majesty. 'I am apprehensive that you may have been afraid to shew my letter to your Mistris, and therefore I have sent the enclosed, directed to her Royall hands. Watch a fitt opportunity, and be you sure, as you tender her good, to present it to her, and I beseech God to bless it.'[15] That Frampton, formerly the Bishop of Gloucester, also had a share in this intrigue, or a similar one, is possible, for in a letter written in February, 1694, to Henry Dodwell, the non-juror, who had accused him of inconsistency and disloyalty to James II occurs the passage: 'If you knew what past . . . betwixt Madam Jessom and me at Bath, you would rank me among your confessors, perhaps deem me ambitious of being a martyr, as it was said of Bishop Ken and me, but certainly would never suspect me of being a Recreant or fugitive from my colours.'[16] There is no evidence that Mary received Ken's letters. The note of yearning affection in them is unmistakeable. Ken still loved his mistress, in spite of her having committed what he regarded as a grievous wrong.

The attitude adopted by the leading non-jurors to Mary was significant. Almost without exception, they combined

[14] Ibid. [15] Plumptre's Life of Ken, II. 304-9.

[16] Bodl. Rawl. Letters 68, ff. 55-7. Mary is reputed to have said that however much Ken and Frampton wished to be martyrs, she would disappoint them. (See Appendix for the text of Ken's letters).

admiration for her personal character with pity for the simplicity that had made her an easy prey to 'casuists' such as Burnet. Dr. Hickes, in forceful language, ascribed wholly to Burnet's influence the decision of the Princess of Orange that she might without sacrifice of scruple displace her father. 'Will he let us know by whose Directions she had so well studied this subject, and by what means She became so much master of the whole argument . . . when we can see the sacred remains of her pen, will it not then appear that our author's argument and hers are the same, or as like . . . as one apple is to another? . . . a Daughter once poisoned with the principle is more then half parricide already, and will like Absolom be ready to grasp at any occasion to ravish the crown from her aged father's head under the fine pretence of subversion whenever ye Achitophels and Shimeis would say that this was the time. Nay, a child so poysoned would be apt to argue, as he saith his innocent victim did, that it would be too late to invade when there was a total subversion. . . . He tells us . . . with what a searching intelligence she penetrated into those things . . . What I said of that unhappy Princess was with due respect to her royal person and quality, and pity for what she had done, but . . . I spoke of him with great severity as one deserved who poysoned her innocent soul.'[17] It is as questionable whether Burnet exerted so potent and formative an influence over the Princess as it is untrue that she was without the mental grit which would enable her successfully to grapple with her problems alone.

Burnet was frequently consulted in the filling of English sees vacant by deprivation, and at the end of 1690 he recommended that Dr. Marsh, Bishop of Ferns, should have a better Irish

[17] Bodl. Rawl. D 841, pp. 83-5.

bishopric, 'he being one of the worthiest and most learned in the nation,' and that certain of the Scotch Episcopal clergy should be transferred to Ulster. It was the Queen, however, who first drew William's attention to the state of the Irish church. After the battle of the Boyne, she wrote: 'Take care of the church in Ireland. Everybody agrees that it is the worst in Christiandom: there are now bishoprics vacant and other things, I beg you will take time to consider who you will fill them with.'[18] There is no trace of a consciousness of any power of initiation on her part; so far the Queen felt herself able only to supplicate. The policy of James had been to keep the Irish sees vacant with the purpose doubtless of rendering inefficient the work of the Protestant church. On the very eve of the Revolution Sancroft and some of the Bishops interceded fruitlessly with the King that the sees might be filled. Mary's plea had effect. William had been in England but a few weeks when he began the work of reforming and purifying the Irish church. He pronounced himself opposed to pluralities and non-residence, and on the 1st November he instructed Nottingham to inform the Lords Justices that he had resolved to appoint a committee of eminent English ecclesiastics to consider all matters relating to the church in Ireland. On the 12th December, 1690, in the Bishop of London's lodgings at Whitehall, a letter containing instructions from the King to six bishops and certain other clergy was read. 'We recommend it particularly to you to consider the ecclesiastical preferments . . . now void, and of the persons best qualified to fill them in respect of their learning, exemplary life, and fidelity in the discharge of their duty.'[19] The first result of the deliberations was the appoint-

[18] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. 11, p. 132.
[19] C. S. P. Dom. 1690-1, pp. 158 f.

ment of Dr. Marsh to the Archbishopric of Cashel, and here we may see the influence of Burnet.

Dr. Marsh kept a diary, and in it are valuable references to the efforts of the Queen on behalf of the church in Ireland. Her influence, however, is not evident until 1692, except in the case of one preferment. In August, 1691, Nottingham wrote to Lord Sidney, at the Queen's command, about the Deanery of Rapho. Sidney and Coningsby, the two Lords Justices, had signed a warrant giving it to a Mr. Chambers, but the King designed it for a Mr. Trench. 'Besides the good service of Mr. Trench, the Queen has received so ill a character of Mr. Chambers that she is very unwilling he should have it.'[20] Mary was here enforcing the will of the King, who obviously regarded the preferment as a reward for service, but her solicitude for the moral worth of the future Dean is expressive of herself. In 1692 she seems to have acted with more initiative. She encouraged and obliged the clergy to residence and the avoidance of pluralities. That she gave personal attention to such matters as church preferments is made quite certain from an event that occurred at the end of 1692. The Lord Lieutenant had recommended Dean Synge to succeed to the bishopric of Killaloe. 'Her Majesty had granted it, but changed her resolution upon the character she received of him which was very disadvantageous and scandalous, and she would have you think of some other person,'[21] wrote Nottingham. The Queen, upon receipt of further representations on behalf of Dean Synge, still refused to consider his nomination, but was willing to ask the opinion of certain eminent bishops in Ireland. 'Their testimonials should not be in general terms, but expressly declaring

[20] Finch MSS, Public Record Office. [21] C. S. P. Dom. 1691-2, p. 463.

their opinion of him as in all respects deserving and well qualified to be a bishop.'[22] Dean Synge was not granted the preferment in spite of efforts made on his behalf. The Queen was determined to oppose all attempts to introduce unworthy persons into the government of the Church. One more instance of her care may be cited. A certain Dean, unnamed, was nominated by her in about the year 1692, for an Irish bishopric. 'His letter was ordered to be drawn, but the officer was at a loss for his style, and the clerk came to me to learn his degree . . . I told him the Dean was a Doctor of Laws . . . he was not graduated in Divinity, when her Majesty was informed thereof, she stopped his letter, and could not be prevailed upon to make him a bishop.'[23] This information was sent by the Archbishop of Dublin to the Duke of Grafton.

The results of the Queen's vigilance and care were becoming apparent in Ireland just as her death cut short her labours. Archbishop Marsh, who had been transferred from Cashel to the see of Dublin early in 1694, records in his diary on the 28th December: 'This morning . . . died that most excellent Princess, Mary, Queen of England, and left me the greatest of her admirers, and faithfullest of her subjects.'[24]

The most conclusive evidence that can be brought forward of the potent influence of the Queen on Irish ecclesiastical affairs is to be found in the correspondence of Archbishop King of Dublin which dates from 1696. 'The time at which this correspondence commences is remarkable, as occurring not long after the Queen's death, which appears to have been in its consequences injurious to the Church of Ireland,' wrote the historian Mant. In September, 1696, King laments the carelessness

[22] Ibid., p. 477. [23] Mant., II. 379. [24] Ibid., p. 49.

and neglect which the church was then experiencing from the government. 'Little care is taken of the church in this Kingdom at Court.'[25] Two weeks later he wrote to the Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, referring to the presence at Court of several clergymen who held livings in Ireland. They were there to 'persuade some . . . to use their influence with his Majesty' to procure them the next bishoprics vacant in Ireland. 'My lord . . . their method is very injurious both to the Church and Government, and I find was so esteemed by her late Majesty.' Bishop King, in the words of Mant, thus 'commemorates with respect the endeavours of the late Queen for checking the abuse complained of, and to deprecate the encouragement of the abuse on the King's part.'[26] He later eulogises the work of the Queen in the words: 'In the appointments to the episcopate, those who were especially entrusted with that important duty, of whom the Queen herself during her life was probably in Ireland as in England, the chief authority, seem to have acted for the most part with integrity and decision.'[27]

The Queen's beneficent influence on English church affairs did not become definite and direct until the year 1692. The more important preferments had been given during the preceding year: in April the warrant for the election of Tillotson to the archiepiscopal see was signed, Sharp was consecrated to York in July, and Tenison to the bishopric of Lincoln in October.

Tillotson's reluctance to accept the primacy is well known. He exercised archiepiscopal jurisdiction until August, 1689, when Sancroft was deprived, but delayed accepting the titular dignity until October, 1690, and even then his decision was

[25] Ibid., p. 65. [26] Ibid., p. 67. [27] Ibid., p. 121.

disclosed to few. 'The King has only acquainted the Queen with it, who, as she came out of the closet on Sunday last, commanded me to wait on her after dinner, which I did; and after she had discoursed about another business (which was to desire my opinion of the treatise sent her in manuscript out of Holland tending to the reconciliation of our differences in England) she told me that the King had with great joy acquainted her with a secret concerning me, whereof she was no less glad, using many gracious expressions.'[28] At about the time of his consecration Tillotson wrote again to Lady Rachel Russell: 'The Queen's extraordinary favour to me, to a degree much beyond my expectation is no small support to me.'[29]

Tillotson's liberal theology did not commend him to a considerable section in the church, and he was often conscious of hostility. 'That party,' says Burnet, set themselves to censure everything he did. To win royal approval of his projects for church reform was therefore almost a necessary condition of their success. He elaborated a scheme for treating christian faith and morals in an annual course of seventy-two sermons, of which Burnet, Patrick, and himself were to be the chief contributors. He was encouraged always by the readiness of the Queen, 'who was incessantly employed in possessing her mind with the best schemes that were either laid before her by others or suggested by her own thoughts,' to promote ecclesiastical reform.

Late in the winter of 1691-2, Mary consulted the Archbishop on the desirability of engaging Burnet to write a treatise on the duties and responsibilities of a Christian pastor. Burnet finished

[28] Tillotson to Lady Rachel Russell, Oct. 25, 1690 (Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 249). [29] Ibid., p. 272.

the work by the end of March, 1692, and then had some correspondence with Tillotson on the question of its dedication. 'I wonder you can have any dispute where to dedicate it . . . Nobody must come into competition with the good Queen, who so well deserves all the respect that can be paid her by all mankind . . . Besides that, I have the curiosity to see the skill of your pen in so tender a point as it will be to do her Majesty right without grating upon her modesty.'[30] A few days later Tillotson left Burnet's manuscript with the Queen, having first read to her the conclusion 'which she will by no means allow; nor anything more than a bare dedication. She says she knows you can use no moderation in speaking of her . . . so resolute and unaffected a modesty I never saw.'[31] A further extract from Tillotson's correspondence with Burnet should be given: on the 11th April a meeting of eight bishops was held for the purpose of drawing up a circular letter recommending to the clergy Burnet's *Pastoral Care*. 'We discoursed very calmly and without the least clashing . . . We dined together with great kindness . . . no small contentment to me . . . I owe all this to the countenance and influence of her Majesty.'[32] Tillotson regarded Burnet's work as 'perfect in its kind,' and Miss Foxcroft thus refers to it in her Life of Burnet: 'Simple, fervent and sincere, the passionate solicitude of the author for the reform of the pastoral ideal lends force and unity to the whole.'[33] Burnet contented himself by thanking God that the treatise had a good effect upon many persons. Mary doubtless read it with almost joyous appreciation, for it was to be a potent instrument to effect an end very dear to her.

[30] Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 289.
[31] Ibid., p. 290 (Tillotson to Burnet).
[32] Ibid., p. 292.
[33] Foxcroft's Life of Burnet, p. 310.

The more rigid section of the clergy—'the high church' party—who regarded with passionate detestation the latitudinarian and the Erastian views of moderate men such as Tillotson and Burnet, and would have welcomed the repeal of the Toleration Act, impeded the work of reform and 'studied to depress' the Archbishop 'all they could.' Tillotson obviously discussed his difficulties with the Queen, and when, in the summer of 1692, Mary chose him to be sponsor with herself to the son of the Marchioness of Winchester, he looked upon it 'as a gracious contrivance of her majesty to let the world know that I have her countenance and support.'[34] That the theological rancour of the time depressed and worried the Queen may be inferred from a remark written by Tillotson some weeks earlier in his commonplace book under the heading 'Serious Resolutions for the regulation of my own conduct'—'not to trouble the Queen any more with my troubles.'[35]

Although Burnet states that in 1693 all church matters were left in Mary's hands, there is little to record of her activities. Was it because she had earned the respect of her husband in the discharge of her duties in the preceding year that he decided that church matters should in future be referred to her? Were there political reasons for his action? We remember Burnet's statement that in 1693 'the Whigs were much turned against the King.' It may be said with truth, however, that Mary displayed remarkable ability in her handling of both Irish and English church affairs during 1692. One preferment made by the Queen in June, 1693, must be noted. Anthony Horneck had been preacher at the Savoy since 1671, and there is abundant testimony as to the spiritual value of his work. His income was

[34] Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 298. [35] Ibid., p. 294.

small and precarious, and after the Revolution was reduced by the withdrawal of support from those who were opposed to the new settlement. Admiral Russell placed his case before the Queen, but at the time she could do nothing. Her brooding self-conscious anxiety as to the interpretation of her acts by others caused her afterwards to discuss the matter with Tillotson. She was fearful lest the Admiral should have thought her too unconcerned on the Doctor's behalf, and on Tillotson's advice promised the next vacant prebend at Westminster. She was able to keep her promise in the summer of 1693.

The Queen gave some thought to the theological controversies of the day. Divines of the Tillotsonian school were accused by their opponents of Socinianism. During 1693 South and Sherlock were in controversy about the Trinity, and on the 3rd January, 1694, the House of Commons passed a vote consigning to the flames an attack on trinitarian doctrine. This state condemnation of unitarianism was but the symbol of a widespread interest in its theories. Mary sometimes sent for Dr. Hooper, Dean of Canterbury, and asked him questions concerning men and things as of one who would not deceive her. 'Why was Tillotson looked upon as a Socinian?'[36] There is a record of her having discussed Socinianism with the Archbishop himself. 'Her late Majesty . . . having heard of Mr. Firmin's usefulness in all public designs, especially those of charity, and that he was heterodox in the articles of the Trinity . . . spoke to Archbishop Tillotson and earnestly recommended it to him to set Mr. Firmin right in those weighty and necessary points.'[37] Firmin has been described as 'Tillotson's philan-

[36] Dr. Hooper's MSS, App. to Trevor's William II, p. 473.
[37] Life of Mr. Thomas Firmin, Late Citizen of London, p. 12.

thropic ally'; he had some part in the distribution of charitable funds deposited in the Chamber of London.

In January, 1694, Burnet published four *Discourses* in which he discussed the 'Atheists and libertines, the Socinians, the Roman Catholics and the Protestant Nonconformists,' and in his discussion digressed to make an impassioned justification of the Revolution. Both the Queen and Tillotson are reputed to have read the manuscript, and the former urged Burnet to begin 'a yet greater work.' This was the Commentary on the Thirty-nine Articles, upon which Burnet busied himself until it was finished in the autumn of 1694.

It seems as though Archbishop Tillotson thought that little had been effected as a result of the labours of the past three years. He often repeated his desire to remove the evils of non-residence and other abuses. For this purpose he convened an episcopal meeting at Lambeth, at which Burnet proposed securing a royal mandate for the two Archbishops to communicate their Majesties' pleasure to the suffragans. Tillotson subsequently, in an audience of the Queen, placed before her his draught of the proposed royal injunction, which she approved, but wanted the King's opinion to be asked. Tillotson refers to this interview in a letter to Burnet on the 10th September, 1694: 'I moved it might be sent to him at the first opportunity, but her Majesty thought that he would put it off to his coming: or, if he should immediately send over his consent, yet his coming probably being so near, it might be liable to some odd construction, as if the King did not much care to appear in it, and therefore it was purposely contrived to be done in his absence. Your Lordship sees how her Majesty's great wisdom looks on every side of a thing.'[38] These injunctions to the clergy

[38] Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 338.

were not issued until February, 1695, and their issue at that time may be regarded as proof that the King, in the first keenness of his sorrow, meant to continue his wife's ecclesiastical policy.

In 1694 Mary found it necessary more than once to assert the King's good will to the Church of England, which makes it certain that there were many who doubted it. It will be remembered that William had been obliged to join forces with the Whigs at the end of 1693. In the British Museum is a copy of a letter which the Queen wrote to 'an unknown Bishop' in April, 1694. After perusal, little doubt of its authenticity can remain. Apart from the facts to which it refers, it is interesting in its revelation of the sentiments that inspired her in regard to her husband and his relations with the church. It should be given in full: 'I have too or three leters from you since your being in the contre to wch I had no good ansere to make, money being so scarce that good wishes has bin all I coud give unless to the pore Vaudois. Mr. Blagrave will have given you an account of all those things, and I hope some satisfaction from Lord Stuard about the place in the Almonery, but that wh. makes me write now is because I woud not have you take the King's refusing the timbers you ask for in a wrong sense, he has so many requests dayly of the same nature that should he grant them, he would not have a tree left, 'tis therefore the consequence he fears, for tho he himself woud distinguish your case, the rest of the world is not so just and everyone thinks his own best. I am sorry you found your business there in so much disorder, tho litle lesse coud be expected from your predesesor. I hope in God the King will never have the misfortune to be mistaken in his choise, for I am sure 'tis his desire, as well as mine, to do

the best he can for the church, and 'tis the greatest pleasure I can have to know he is sincere and will do more for it than he says, let us both have your prayers. I am sure we stand in need of them, especially myself, now the King is so neer going. I recon upon them, as you may do upon my being ever your friend, Marie R. I hope when you have time, you will go on with your cronology, 'tis so hard a word I fear I don't spel it right, but you know what I mean,—that's enough. Kensington, April 2. 1694.'[39] It is possible to establish the fact that this letter was written to Sharp, the Archbishop of York. It provides a good summary of the Queen's activities in ecclesiastical affairs. She was generous when means allowed, exceedingly conscientious in her choice of men for the ministry, and an inspiration to those who by the written or spoken word were seeking to spread the truth in which she believed. Finally, it illustrates her eager desire to interpret the actions of her husband to her countrymen in such a way that distrust and suspicion should be removed, and the peaceful and permanent acceptance of his dominion ensured.[40]

[39] Brit. Mus. Add. 28, 927, f. 49.

[40] On 16th December, 1692, the Chapter of the Collegiate Church of Southwell, Nottinghamshire, petitioned for the payment of arrears, amounting to about £500 on account of an annual pension granted to them by Edward VI. The Chapter desired to set up an afternoon sermon or lecture with the money, 'nevertheless, they, knowing their Majesties' great occasion, do not petition for the said arrears in specie, but only for some trees in the Forest of Sherwood . . . to the value of £500, . . . the money raised . . . to be lodged in the Archbishop of York, their visitor' (C. S. P. Dom. 1692, p. 526). On 29th December, 1692, Nottingham wrote to the Archbishop of York, in whose diocese the Collegiate Church of Southwell then was, saying that the King was unwilling to grant the timber, but would give money (Life of Archbishop Sharp, by Thos. Sharp, p. 232). The payment was made four years later, out of the tenths of the diocese of Lincoln. Between the years 1692 and 1696 Archbishop Sharp wrote several treatises, including 'The Lives and Acts of the Archbishops from Paulinus' to his predecessor, Lamplough. May this not have been Mary's 'Cronology'? 'Mr. Blagrave' is probably Mr. Jonathan Blagrave, the Queen's sub-Almoner.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE QUEEN'S INFLUENCE ON SOCIETY

MANY were the panegyrics which appeared after the death of the Queen. The language in which she was praised seems extravagant, and even at times ridiculous,[1] but there is to be found in all the sermons and pamphlets of the time reference to the potent influence for good that she exerted. The unanimity of evidence is significant: she certainly appeared to the majority of her contemporaries as a woman of singular virtue and power.

Her days were long; she usually arose at six o'clock and then spent two or three hours in retirement. 'How she employed Herself, we may more than guess, by the Choice Collection of Books she furnished . . . [her closet] . . . with, as well of Divinity as History, and other Learned and Ingenious Treatises.'[2] Before beginning this period of study and prayer, she fortified herself with 'a Dish of Tea[3] . . . or some such slight Breakfast.'[4] Then followed her dressing time, during which she received petitions and transacted business. 'She would have reading, when there

[1] 'Some of our London Divines . . . have played the fool in their hyperbolical commendation of the Queen, that looks like fulsome flattery and . . . blasphemy. Her own works commend her in the gate, and she hath thereby erected a more lasting monument in the hearts of her subjects then their vain paneygyrics will give her' (Richard Stretton to Ralph Thoresby, Feb. 23, 1694-5; Correspondence of Thoresby). Stretton was a Presbyterian minister, a Manager of the 'Common Fund,' one of the first Noncomformists measures adopted in London after the passage of the Toleration Act.

[2] Memoirs of the Life and Death of Queen Mary, by Edward, Lord Bishop of Gloucester (Bodl. Pamph. 220).

[3] The Queen paid a high price for her tea. An account that remained unpaid at her death contained the items: '25 lbs of fine Tea at 3 guineas per lb, and 6 1-2 lbs at 3 1-2 guineas' (Brit. Mus. Add. 5751 (A), f. 14).

[4] Memoirs, by the Bishop of Gloucester.

was a vacancy for it,'[5] and often read aloud herself to the ladies who were in attendance 'some Book or Poem that was lively as well as interesting,' and made suitable comment;—'the gloss was often better liked than the text.'[6] She spent much time in working with her hands,[7] and her example was soon followed by 'the whole town . . . a greater step was made than perhaps everyone was aware of to the bettering of the age.'[8] Then between chapel prayers and dinner, she walked in the gardens, and saw there 'how the Gardeners had observed her orders,'[9] and further instructed them what to do.

The Bishop of Gloucester praises her for her sobriety and freedom from vanity. 'I am sorry that so few of our Ladies could ever persuade themselves to have the ambition herein to resemble Her: And that the Example of a Queen should be of little Force: nay, of so little as not to be able to make such childish vanities as Spotted Faces out of Fashion.'[10] Yet, in the Privy Purse Accounts for 1694 is the significant entry of 'a paper of patches one shilling,' and a bill of the jeweler James Scheult includes the items 'for a Pockett Glass with a gold fraime the Back lined with chagreen, garnished with gold pins £6, and for a Gold pach-box with an agatt stone cover £10.'[11] If these articles were for Mary, as presumably they were, we fear that she was not quite free from vanity.

The Bishop's eulogy continues: 'And tho Queens, of all Ladies may be . . . Excused, if they should exceed in their Wardrobe, our Queen was so far from being liable to censure upon that account that a Gentleman of Great Worth,[12] whose office

[5] Ibid. [6] Burnet's Memorial of Mary, p. 38. [7] Ibid., p. 36.
[8] Burnet's Memorial of Mary, p. 37.
[9] Memoirs, by the Bishop of Gloucester, p. 10.
[10] Ibid., p. 8. [11] Brit. Mus. Add. 5751 (A), f. 142. [12] Sir Stephen Fox.

would not let him be ignorant of her expences, did some time since profess, that he was very unwilling to say how little she laid out upon apparel.' The accounts reveal that Mary did exercise economy, for she did not disdain renovations. One 'Daniell Browne' charged one pound ten shillings in September 1694 for 'putting a Rich Ermine Mantle into a new Outside.' The saving thus effected is somewhat neutralised, however, by his charge in November for a 'Rich Sable Back Muff £11,' and 'For Lyneing Her Majesty's pettycoate with Choyce Squirrill Bellys, £6.'[13] Then, when we read that her Majesty bought thirty-six pairs of slippers made of gold lace and satin at £1.12.0. per pair in the space of four months, we begin to question the truth of the Bishop's statements. It is true that in November, 1690, £5 only was charged for a 'Black Velvett Gowne,' but when we discover that £15 was paid for lace for a handkerchief, we are bewildered.

Against Mary's honour and chastity the voice of scandal was never raised, and the morals of her court were, if not unassailable, yet purer than that of her predecessors, and its general tone was high. She was often surprised, however, at the lack of any general expression of a religious spirit, and considered how she could make 'devotion more serious.' She was heard to declare that for her there was nothing in the possession of power that was 'pleasant or even supportable' but the obligation it involved of 'doing good and making the world better,' and her simple piety caused her to think that unless the nation cast away its sins, God could give no blessing to its military or naval enterprises. She ordered that prayers should be sung in Chapel, —but was distressed that she could not make people 'mind the

[13] Brit. Mus. Add. 5751 (A), f. 129.

Sunday more.' She began the custom of having sermons at Whitehall in the afternoon, and 'this pleased me myself and most sober people.' We may wonder with what sentiments she listened to a sermon which Tillotson preached before her in September, 1690, in which he praised to the whole Court the pattern set them by the Queen 'of a decent and unaffected devotion, of a most serious and steady attention, without wandering, without diversion, and without *drowsiness;* such an example as I cannot but hope will in a short time gain upon us all, and by a more gentle and silent reproof win us to the imitation of it.'[14]

The evidence of non-clerical writers as to the Queen's manner of conducting herself must not be ignored. Card-playing was one of the most fashionable pastimes of the day, and there are many references to Mary's interest in basset. Was it merely the noble condescension of a great spirit to the frailties of lesser beings? We think not. She wrote on the 9th August, 1694, to Lady Scarborough: 'You were mightily wanted at Lord Ranelagh's, but I believe it was well for you, for everybody lost, except Lord Bradford, who went back by water as soon as the tide served, which was a pretence to rise a winner.'[15] Here is a display of critical acumen, but not of the sublime and lofty spirit of one who is so far out of touch with the realities of human nature that its frailties and weaknesses are not apparent as was the Mary of Burnet and Fowler. A correspondent of the Earl of Rutland informed him that 'My Lord President on Twelfth Night raffled with the Queen, and having lost his 2 guineas, returned home early to bed.'[16]

[14] Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 240. [15] Brit. Mus. Add. 24905.
[16] Hist. MSS Comm., Rutland MSS. Vol. XII, p. 153.

Mr. Goodwin Wharton records in his Autobiography that he frequently had visions in which the Lord commanded him to visit the Queen. One of these occasions was the day after the King went to Ireland in 1690. 'The Lord bid me goe see the Queene, or she would take it very ill, which I did as she was going by to prayers, but she turned her head aside . . . as I thought with some sort of pride, the government coming now into her hands . . . and so I went away.' Again on the 23rd July 'the Lord told me I should goe speake to the Queene, and he'd tell me what to say . . . I went then, and saw the Queen at the Princess's dinner, who, as soon as she saw me, lifted up her eyes to Heaven in thanks for it (for I had kept away a good while . . . and made her sufficiently concerned at it . . .) The next day, I went again to the Queen's dinner, and finding that she laughed at some malicious thing her sister had yesterday told her, I went away.'[17] These brief extracts give a glimpse of a very human and faulty creature.

Mary's desire 'to do good' took practical form in the encouragement of charitable enterprise. She was always willing to help those in poverty or distress, and there is no doubt that the documents do not place on record evidence of all her munificent acts. The Bishop of Gloucester 'had good reason to believe from what he knew that Her own hands were likewise large Dispensers of very Private charities';[18] and Burnet (in what Miss Foxcroft calls his 'fine rhapsody' with its 'luxuriance of appreciation' and 'almost lyrical fervour') says: 'The miserable amongst ourselves, particularly those who suffered by the accidents of war, found in her a Relief . . . She would never limit

[17] Autobiography of Goodwin Wharton.
[18] Memoirs by the Bishop of Gloucester.

any from placing proper objects for her charity in her way, nor confine that care to the ministers of the almonry.'[19] In the privy purse accounts previously referred to are two which have considerable interest. One is headed: 'By Order of Madam van Goldstein, privy purse to her Majesty, laid out for the two children that are boarded with me. Mary Gates. November 4th., 1693.' Then come the following items:

	£.	s.	d.
2 pairs of new shoes and thread to mend their clothes		4.	10
I paid for schooling breaking up firing books pens and ink		2.	6
Paid for a scarf and a hood for the girl		16.	6
Two prs shoes and two prs stockings and mending the boys clothes		12.	0
Paid for three times cutting the boys haire		1.	6
At Whitsuntide breaking up 2 prs shoes and a fan		8.	0
A new frock and breeches for the boy		14.	0
Paid apoticarys bill when the boy was sick		8.	0
Laid out for a cosy winter coat		12.	0
Laces for the girl			6

Madam van Goldstein's signature appears at the foot of the bill after the words: 'I own that the money mentioned in this bill was layd out for Her Majesty's service.'[20] The importance of the paper is in its witness to the truth of the statements made concerning Mary's private charities.

Another account supplies details of one of Mary's generous actions which is well known. She stayed for a few days at Canterbury upon one of the occasions when she accompanied William to his place of embarkation for Holland. She went to the Cathedral service on Sunday morning and observed that their 'furniture was dirty.' Shortly afterwards she sent for Dr. Hooper,

[19] An essay on the Late Queen, 1695, Burnet, p. 27.
[20] Brit. Mus. Add. 5751 (A), f. 197.

the Dean of Canterbury—who had been her chaplain in Holland—'and carried him to her dressing room, and showed him some pieces of silver stuffs and purple flowered velvets, which . . . she intended to give to the Cathedral . . . The altar was furnished with a pain of the figured velvet, and a paine of gold stuff flowered with silver, and the Archbishop's throne with plain velvet, the fring for both was a ruffted one, of gold silver and purple, which alone cost £500.' So wrote Dr. Hooper. We now know that the 'gold and purple knoted fringe and tassells' cost about £240, while the bill of the upholsterer for making the altar-cloth, table cloth, and throne was just over £213.[21]

The state papers reveal traces of many other small pensions and gratuities, which it would be tedious to enumerate in detail. The fact is clearly established that no application for help was made to the Queen which she did not try to satisfy.

The King and Queen both desired to exercise leniency whereever possible towards those accused of civil or political offences. Many were the petitions received by the Queen for reprieve of sentences, and there is little doubt that these were considered personally by her. One case has peculiar interest—and not only as an illustration of the Queen's clemency. A Scot named John McMillan was sentenced to death by the Scotch Lords of the Judiciary, for the murder of one Thomas Grerson of Bargalton. The man's wife petitioned the Queen, and Mary, after asking the advice of the Attorney General, granted a reprieve until the King's pleasure could be known. The Scotch councillors regarded this as an encroachment upon their legal prerogative, and Mary was constrained, probably by the Earl of Melvill, who was in London at the time, to send an attesta-

[21] Ibid., ff. 136f.

tion that the letter reprieving McMillan had been written by her direction. 'We do hereby declare that George, Earl of Melville, our Secretary of State for the Kingdom of Scotland, did draw, subscrib, and send away the . . . letter by our special command, and according to our direction.' Signed 'Marie R.'[22]

The Queen's influence may also be traced in attempts that were made to relieve the condition of the poor. The King in December each year authorised collections to be made for this purpose in all the London churches, and it is not unreasonable to infer that in this he was moved by his humane consort. She always gave her whole-hearted support to any enterprise which would find work for those in need. On the 12th May, 1691, a petition was presented to her from Sir Thomas Rowe and others stating that 'a great many poor in this kingdom . . . are reduced to beggary or worse courses . . . and that several foreign commodities were . . . imported which might be made here, and thus many thousands of people might be set to work . . . Divers persons . . . of great worth are willing to erect workhouses and to raise considerable sums of money to set the poor to work and pray' to be given a charter.[23] Mary referred this to the Attorney General, and was present at a meeting of the Privy Council on the 21st May, at which his report was received. It was decided that the erection of such public workhouses by a 'joynt stock' might be of great advantage. On the 22nd June the warrant was issued for the preparation of the charter. We do not know if there was any opposition in the Privy Council to this charter, but such a typically Whig measure would be hardly likely to pass without some, even if supported

[22] The Melvills and the Leslies, by Sir W. Fraser, II. 52. Melvill was obviously afraid lest responsibility should be assigned to him by the Scotch Council. [23] C. S. P. Dom. 1691-2, p. 369.

by the approval of the Queen. That she realised its political significance is doubtful. A similar petition made in June, 1691, by the Governor of the Corporation of the Linen Manufacture, for financial support was referred to the Treasury, 'Her Majesty being graciously disposed' for its encouragement.[24] As further evidence of the Queen's interest in native industry, reference should be made to a letter from Nottingham to Sir Gabriel Robartes dated September 1, 1693. 'The Queen has commanded me to signify her wishes to you to be communicated to the Turkey Company that you and they should enquire in the best and most proper method what quantity of fine silk there is now in England, in the manufacture thereof the poor are usually employed, and for how long that quantity will serve to employ them . . . The Queen wishes this account laid before her with as much haste as possible.'[25] These facts make it possible to concur in the statement that 'the poor were obliged to her for the Good they received from others, as they ow'd to God the good that she did and caused to be done.'[26]

The King and Queen were concerned at the end of 1690 to hear of the existence of abuses in the hospitals, and it is without surprise that we find Mary in January, 1691, appointing a commission to inspect and report upon them. 'The Queen is informed that divers great abuses and irregularities are committed in all or most of the hospitals or houses of charity within this kingdom, whereby great wrong is done to the poor, etc.'[27] This was followed by the issue of a warrant for the inspection of the London hospitals. Mary must have given much thought to the need of caring especially for wounded soldiers and sailors

[24] C. S. P. Dom. 1691-2, p. 424. [25] Ibid., 1693, p. 298.
[26] Dr. Abbadie's Panegyric (Bodl. Pamph. 220).
[27] C. S. P. Dom. 1690-1, p. 241.

and those permanently maimed in the war. Chelsea Hospital had been founded at the beginning of 1685 for the relief of injured soldiers, but it was not completed until more than a year after the Revolution. Mary wrote to the Bishop of London on the 12th August, 1691: 'We, having finished the Royal Hospital at Chelsea, for the maintenance of old and maimed soldiers . . . desire you to consecrate the . . . chapel and burial land, etc.'[28] But it is with the foundation of Greenwich Hospital that her name has always been associated.

The problem of the dearth of seamen was one of the first with which Mary was confronted after William's departure for Ireland in 1690: she was present at a meeting of the Privy Council at the beginning of July at which reference was made to it. The weakness of the naval administration in the post-Revolution period, and the financial difficulties that lay behind it were partly responsible for this problem. Not only the irregularity in the payment of wages, but also the hardships of the sea-faring life and the fact that there was little provision for sick and wounded sailors and those maimed in battle and their dependents contributed to make it difficult properly to man the ships. In February, 1691, the Privy Council again discussed the matter, and on the 5th Mary appointed a Commission to look after sick and wounded seamen. She wanted so to ease the circumstances of the sailor's life that it would be less difficult to get the loyal and efficient service that the conflict with France demanded. In May, 1692, after La Hogue, when the Queen must have realised the need of an institution for the reception of sailors wounded in battle, we find the first reference to Greenwich Hospital. On the 27th Nottingham wrote to the

[28] Ibid., p. 484.

Commissioners of the Treasury desiring them to hasten 'as much as possible the grant of Greenwich as a hospital for seamen, which is now depending before you, or otherwise that you report your opinion in the case to her Majesty with all speed.'[29] Sometime during the next four months it was found that a piece of ground adjacent to the palace would be very convenient for the service of the hospital, and on the 15th October Nottingham again wrote to the Commissioners: 'Their Majesties having granted the "house" at Greenwich . . . and there being a paper depending before you for annexing an adjacent piece of ground . . . Her Majesty would have you consider this paper: and if you have no objection against it, to prepare a warrant, in order to the passing of a grant of the said "House." '[30] What temporarily obstructed the scheme does not transpire.

In the early months of 1694 a Committee of the Privy Council was appointed to examine into complaints of irregularities in the administration of the Commissioners for the Sick and Wounded. Mary was present at the meeting at which the report of the Committee was received. 'Upon consideration thereof, Her Majesty thought fit the said Commissioners should have a reprimand given them, which, they being called in, was done accordingly by the Lord President.'[31] In December, 1694, twenty-four hours before the symptoms of her last illness appeared, she referred to the hospital for seamen in a conversation with Burnet. In 1695, owing to the determination of William that this darling project of his wife's should at last be realised, an 'Act for the Increase and Encouragement of Seamen' was passed, and the warrant signed.

[29] C. S. P. Dom. 1691-2, p. 301. [30] Ibid., p. 481.
[31] Privy Council Register, May 31, 1694.

A chapter of Mary's influence on Society is not complete without some reference to the foundation of the College in Virginia. Burnet records that 'Mary took particular methods to be well-informed of the state of our plantations . . . It was no small grief to her to hear that they were but too generally a reproach to the religion by which they were named. She gave a willing ear to a proposition that was made for . . . the founding of a college among them. She considered the whole scheme . . . and the endowment which was desired for it, so well that she herself answered all objections and espoused the matter with so affectionate a concern that she prepared it for the King to settle.'[32] In the House of Burgesses of Virginia in May, 1691, was read 'the address to their Majesties . . . as to the College.'[33] Within a few days James Blair was sent to England to petition for a charter for the College, which was to be incorporated by the name of King William and Queen Mary, and to get leave to collect donations.'[34] The King authorised collections for the erection of churches and schools in Virginia to be made in all dioceses four times during the next two years.[35] This is the first response to the appeal from the Virginia Burgesses. On September 1, 1692, the Queen made an Order in Council granting to the College certain 'quit rents,' the produce of tobacco 'collected in lieu of the penny per lb,' certain lands, and 'the office of Surveyor General to be likewise granted to the College for ever.'[36] The foundation stone was not laid, however, until 1695. If Burnet's evidence had not been forthcoming, the Queen's interest in this institution could not have been proved.

[32] Memorial of Mary, Burnet, p. 61.
[33] C. S. P. Amer. 1689-92, p. 451.
[34] Ibid., pp. 452 f.
[35] C. S. P. Dom. 1691-2, p. 542.
[36] C. S. Amer. 1689-92, p. 693.

After the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, many thousands of French Protestants sought refuge in other countries. Mary had taken an active interest in the relief of refugees in Holland, and Burnet and Fowler often refer to her charity when she became Queen, in assisting those who were persecuted for their faith.

Collections for charitable objects had been authorised by brief in the preceding reign, and William continued this custom in 1689 by authorising the Commissioners of the Great Seal to issue briefs for the relief of French and Irish Protestants on the 12th and 14th March respectively. The Proclamation appeared for the collection for Irish Protestants on the 26th April.[37] On the 15th of that month the French ministers presented a petition to the House of Commons praying for a yearly relief for the support of the refugees rising from a tax to be put on hackney coaches, and a committee was appointed to consider this. On the very day of the presentation of the petition, the Privy Council passed a resolution that French Protestants should be invited to England and that they should be assured of protection. On the 24th the Committee issued its report: 'Two thousand persons . . . now are reduced to utmost misery: and must infallibly perish and starve unless assisted by this House . . . A revenue of £17,200 per annum is necessary for the support of the distressed French protestants . . . The new imposition upon wine and vinegar which is to expire 20th July 1693, is a proper fund for the charging the said sum.'[38] Why did the house adjourn without discussing these recommendations? On the next day appeared the Proclamation of the King and Queen for the Encouragement of French Protestants.[39]

[37] C. S. P. Dom. 1689-90, pp. 19, 21. [38] Commons Journal, X. 103.
[39] Tudor and Stuart Proclamations.

On the 19th, while the Committee was still sitting, Mary made a grant to the French refugees out of her privy purse,[40] and the amount so generously given was £15,000.

The case of the Irish Protestants was also considered by a committee, and they advised raising money on East India Stock, to which the house agreed, but on the 15th June they decided that an address relating to the Irish protestants should be presented to his Majesty, praying that the sum of £15,000 might be forthwith distributed amongst them. On the 10th August it was resolved that his Majesty should be reminded of the address of the house for the bestowal of £15,000. It may reasonably be inferred that the Irish Protestants were desiring an equality of treatment with the French. The analogy presented by these happenings is supporting evidence of the issue of Mary's grant of £15,000 on the 19th April.[41]

In the recently published Downshire MSS is a copy of a petition sent by certain French ministers to Sir William Trumbull in December, 1695. They make grave allegations as to the methods of distribution of the relief funds. 'The ministers have received nothing of the £1000 given by the late Queen in August, 1691.'[42] This is the only explicit statement of the Queen's munificence that has come to light. Another interesting allusion is made by the ministers, however. In the dis-

[40] See Audit Office Declared Accounts, Privy Purse Roll 3A, Bundle 1922. A-c from 24th June 1697-1699 of Edward Nicholas, Treasurer and Receiver General to Her Majesty, Easter Term IX. Wm. III. upon account to be supplied towards the support of poor French Protestants by vertue of a Privy Seal dated 19th April 1689, and a warrant under the royal signe manuall dated 3rd June, IX. Wm. III. £15,000 (Referred to by Wm. A. Shaw, in English Historical Review, 1894, p. 662), p. 00.

[41] Mr. Shaw misses the significance of the analogy by erroneously quoting the amount asked for as £5000.

[42] Downshire MSS, I. 600 (Hist. MSS. Comm.).

tribution of certain legacies, including one from Lord Halifax, the pensioners were made to sign 'as if this was part of the Royal Grant.'[43] The question that now arises is: was this 'Royal Grant' the £15,000 which was paid annually by Mary out of her jointure?—the £1000 paid in August, 1691, being an additional gift. That there was an annual grant of £15,000 is confirmed by another document in the Downshire collection. There was a suggestion that the French refugees, if they did not use their vote in accordance with the wishes of the court at the Westminster Election of 1710, 'might lose their annual grant of £15,000, it being thought by some that this should not be eternal'.[45] The continuance of this grant after Mary's death confirms that William kept his promise: 'Our Will and pleasure is that the establishment of the sallaries and charitable pencons to our late dear Consort the Queen's family and servants be continued from Lady Day 1695 until we signify our further pleasure';[45] and Anne carried on what had become a customary payment. From what we know of the Queen's mind, we realise that she would regard it as a most serious obligation to offer help to those who had abandoned their country for the sake of religion.

We have to record the history of another social movement in which the Queen took a great part, the attempt to effect a reformation in manners and morals. The immorality and irreligion of so large a section of English society during the latter half of the seventeenth century had been ascribed by some writers to a reaction against the severe restraint of the Puritan régime; and by others to the general lack of religious and secular education. Ignorance and vice go often together, but it is equally

[43] Ibid.

true that nature has a way of taking revenge. Whatever may have been the cause, the spiritual deadness and moral laxity of England at the Revolution period were obvious to thoughtful contemporaries.

Burnet, in the summer of 1688, when he was on his way to London in the train of the Prince of Orange, made the proposal that the Prince should recommend to the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London 'the suppression of vice and the excesses of drinking.'[46] William was also asked by some zealous reformer to issue a Declaration against debauchery on the lines of one presented to him.[47] There is no record, however, of these suggestions having been acted upon. In the House of Lords, on the 27th January, 1689, a bill was read for the second time 'for the better explanation and making effectual the statutes made for the relief of the poor.' The bill was referred to a committee, including the three Bishops of Salisbury, London, and Chester. One of its clauses has importance in the history of the movement to reform manners. Parishioners were commanded 'to examine and enquire what disorderly taverns, inns, ale-houses, bawdy-houses, gaming or music houses there are within their respective parishes wherein . . . drunkenness, whoredom, idleness . . . or other corruptions are supported . . . and also what disorderly, idle, licentious persons . . . are within their parishes and do make and draw up a presentment in writing of such . . . to be in the hands of the churchwardens and overseers.'[48] On the 13th February, 1690, the King sent a letter to the Bishop of London which was to be circulated throughout the

[44] Ibid., p. 903 f.
[45] Public Record Office, Treasury Warrants XI. 96 (4 May 1695).
[46] Sidney's Diary (Blencowe), II. 287. [47] Bodl. Pamph. 190.
[48] House of Lords MSS, 1689-90, pp. 448-451.

Provinces of Canterbury and York, in which the clergy were to be instructed to preach frequently against vice and debauchery, and to read the Statutes of the land against such sins. Only by inference is it possible to form some conception of what occurred between the prorogation of parliament and the issue of these injunctions. Burnet probably had access to the Queen, for he records that the reforming of the manners of her people was one of her chief cares, and that 'this was no sooner moved to her than she set it going.'[49]

Some of the sermons are extant in which the clergy sought to obey the royal command. The Court and the House of Commons were not spared, and from every pulpit in the country exhortations to reformation were made during the next months. Such methods could have no widespread or general effect.

Inspired by the preaching of William Beveridge and others, societies of young men began to form for devotional purposes in about 1678. Anthony Horneck, Preacher at the Savoy, gave them encouragement, and Tillotson and Compton both approved of their methods and aims. 'Queen Mary . . . took great satisfaction in these religious societies.' Their members did not initiate the lay movement for the reformation of manners, which probably began in 1690, although they certainly gave it support. One religious charity which may be a fruit of the reforming zeal of Burnet and the King and Queen is the distribution of Bibles by Philip, Lord Wharton, in the West Riding of Yorkshire, which continues to this day.

The results of the national course of sermons was not encouraging, and we find in January, 1691, the issue of a proclamation 'on the pious address of the Archbishops and Bishops'

[49] Memorial to Mary, Burnet, p. 52.

requiring all magistrates 'to execute the laws of the land' against vice. The education of public opinion having failed, it was resolved to strengthen civic authority.

On the 30th October, 1690, by proclamation William offered a reward for those discovering robbers and highwaymen, and at a meeting of the Privy Council, at which the Queen was present, a committee was formed on the 19th February, 1691, to consider of expedients for better securing the streets from robbers and disorderly persons. This persistence of effort is praiseworthy, and speaks well for the zeal of the few persons, of whom assuredly the Queen was one, who initiated the movement.

Response came at last: the police officials and certain dwellers in the Tower Hamlets made a private agreement to try to suppress the open immorality of their suburb, apparently as a result of the encouragement given to such action by the proclamations against higfhway robbers; many of these, and other criminals, doubtless ound shelter in houses of ill fame. Soon afterwards another society was formed in the Strand, probably by one Edward Stephens, for the suppression of debauchery and vice. 'This mischief . . . like a Torrent had overspread the whole nation . . . Received great encouragement from the Remissness and Negligence of the Magistrates and Justices of the Peace in not duly executing the laws . . . This appear'd a Difficulty above their Power to overcome, and for which no proper and effectual remedy could be thought on below Her Majesty's authority.'[50] Stillingfleet, the Bishop of Worcester, was commissioned to procure a letter from Mary to the Magistrates o f

[50] A Seasonable and Necessary Admonition to the Gentlemen of the First Society for the Reformation of Manners, 1700 (Brit. Mus. 4105. d. 76. (14)).

Middlesex. Her Majesty 'most cheerfully' granted the request, and issued her commands in a letter dated the 9th July, 1691. An Order of Sessions was made the day following to encourage 'good citizens . . . to give informations against prophane and vicious persons,' and this was printed, together with the Queen's letter, and sent throughout the Kingdom 'to most Parliament men, Mayors, Bailiffs, Justices of the Peace, Ministers, Coffee Houses.'[51] Societies to forward the reformation of manners sprang up everywhere: but more evidence is extant as to the progress of the movement in London and Middlesex. We read of societies of gentlemen and citizens, of tradesmen and of informers.

That Mary meant to have the laws enforced in her own household is certain, for she notified to the chief officers of the Guards 'Her Royall Pleasure that they strictly ęnjoyn all ye souldiers under them to refrain from swearing and drunkenness.'[52]

What was the popular response to this courageous action on the part of the Queen? The following evidence is worth recording: 'La Reyne a pris une bonne résolution et digne de sa piété en donnant des ordres pour une réformation publique les jours de dimanche afin d'obliger d'autant plus le peuple d'aller à l'église, et d'empêscher certaines personnes libertines d'aller courir aux cabarats aux environs de la ville. Il n'y aura ny carosses de luage ny cabaret pour boire ny manger, et on punira les blasphémateurs . . . ce bon ordre commença avant hyer dimanche et en ramarqua que les églises étoient plus rem-

[51] Vindication of an Undertaking . . . Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester (Bodl. Tanner. 823).

[52] Newsletter to the Earl of Huntingdon, July 28, 1691 (Carte MSS, 76 f. 106).

plies qu'à l'ordinaire. On croit que cela diminuera les droits de l'excise, parceque le peuple boit plus le dimanche que les autres jours, mais n'importe, la Reyne a bien fait.' Private letters of the period frequently contain allusions to the movement. On the 4th August, Robert Harley wrote to Sir Edward Harley: 'It is a matter for great rejoicing that the attempt for Reformation of Manners succeeds beyond expectation: and the city concurs so far.' St Bartholomew's Fair was only to be held for three days for the sale of cattle, for 'thereby will be prevented a great deal of lewdness.' On the 15th another letter contained the statement: 'The design of outward reformation goes on vigorously. The Duke of Norfolk was constrained to pay £5 for breaking the sabbath day by gambling. The Queen has been persuaded to send to the Lord Mayor to enlarge the time of Bartholomew Fair to what is usual.'[53]

The scribblers of the town who lived by the sale of squibs and lampoons, did not allow this occasion to pass without comment. On the 18th September a 'poem' entitled *Ecclesia Reviviscens*, or 'A short account of the Rise, Progress and Present State of the New Reformation,' was printed in Fleet Street for Thos. Salusbury.

> The Throne our very wishes did prevent
> Vouchsafed unasked a free protection
> Unto our cause, and spurred us briskly on.
> The Queen became our patroness. So kind
> Was Majesty! So much to good inclined.
> Her Royal Hand dispatched a message to
> Her Justices, and charged them what to do
> Chear up poor Virtue, Value not the Spight
> Of Envious Vice: Whitehall's thy Proselyte

[53] Hist. MSS Comm., Portland MSS, III, p. 472.

We then did cry: And hoped our work would be
Successful, since 'twas backed by Authority. . . .

But mark what follows, sin outdares the men
Laughs at their weak efforts, bids them agen
To rally up their utmost forces, and try
If they could make her ramparts level lie . . .
The swearer swears on still and fears no law.
. . . . Drunkenness is still,
As 'twas before, the Darling of the Isle.
Prophaning of the Sabbath is by all
Accounted, if a sin, but very small. . . .
And that which most of all shocks our design
Is the allowance of a fortnight's sin
To Smithfield revellers.

The societies of informers made it their duty to patrol the streets and to visit the alehouses and places of amusement with the object of reporting cases of illegal profanity and immorality. A moment's consideration will bring a realisation of the state of affairs that ensued. Overmuch zeal caused the issue of warrants on very slender evidence: the spite of vengeful and malicious men found expression in the accusation of innocent people; and honest and discreet informers often shared in the punishment meted out by indignant citizens.

In a letter dated the 24th November, 1691, Edward Harley wrote to Sir Edward Harley giving an account of proceedings taken against Sir Richard Buckley, Mr. Hartley, and Mr. Yates, on the ground that Mr. Hartley had issued more than 800 warrants in two months against ale-house keepers, and 'Sir Richard Buckley kept an office in Lincoln's Inn to encourage persons to inform.'[54] Six weeks later Edward Harley wrote

[54] Hist. MSS Comm., Portland III, p. 482.

again: 'The informers against vice are like to fall under great hardships, some lewd villians having discovered where they meet to pray and sing psalms twice a week, have presumed to direct the press-masters to find them, that they may be carried off to sea . . . some of them were carried away last year, and never heard of. The great increase in these good societies and their exemplary piety gave great hopes that the glory would not depart from these sinful lands.'[55]

But it is obvious that the Queen and the clergy did not regard the result of their endeavours as quite satisfactory, for another proclamation was issued on the 21st January, 1692, urging the magistrates to a strict execution of the laws against immorality. The responsibility of magistrates and police officials is clearly stated in the proclamation: 'By a long continued neglect of the officers concerned, these dissolute enormities had universally spread themselves to the dishonour of God, and the scandal of our holy religion.'[56] It is therefore not surprising to find that in the spring of this year alterations were made in the commissions of the peace for Middlesex and Westminster by 'Her Majesty's special command, wherein are placed most of these gentlemen, who are lately become known to have been concerned in this noble undertaking: and I pray God the success of it may be answerable to Her Majesty's pious design,'[57]— so wrote Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester. How far is he correct in assigning the desire to reform manners and morals as the cause of the removal of certain obstructing or neglectful members of the Bench in March and April, 1692? Is it safe to accept his authority solely for Mary's initiation of the changes?

[55] Ibid., p. 487. [56] Cal. of State Papers, 1691-2, p. 106.
[57] A Vindication of an Undertaking, by Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester (Bodl. Tanner. 823).

Before the King left England, at the beginning of March, he ordered the removal of sixteen justices, 'thinking it necessary for his service.'[58] On the 7th April Nottingham notified the Commissioners of the Great Seal of other alterations which had been recommended by the Earl of Bedford, Custos Rotulorum of Middlesex, and Lord Lieutenant of the County from the preceding January. A significant fact emerges: two of the new justices are 'Sir Richard Bulkley and——Yates, Esq.,'[59] and these may be indentified with the men mentioned in Edward Harley's letter of the 24th November, 1691, who had proved themselves zealous in the cause of reform. This is some confirmation of the Bishop's assertion. To trace Mary's influence is more difficult, but it may be mentioned that the Earl of Bedford, then nearing eighty years of age, was a Privy Councilor and father-in-law of Lady Rachel Russell, for whom Mary had sincere affection.

That there was still weakness in the execution of the law may be gleaned from the fact that in May, 1693, Sir John Somers, the Lord Keeper, addressed a 'personal excitation' to the Justices of Middlesex 'By Her Majesty's special command.'[60]

By 1694 the societies of reformers had been in existence long enough to make it possible to draw up a statistical report of their work. Several murderers had been traced by members, many houses of ill fame had been discovered, and no less than 313 prosecutions had been made during the year 1693-4.[61]

[58] C. S. P. Dom. 1691-2, pp. 165 f.

[59] Ibid., p. 220. A 'Sir Richard Buckley' is reputed to have been a friend of Burnet's.

[60] An Account of the Rise and Progress of the Religious Societies, by Josiah Woodward, D.D.

[61] Proposals for a National Reformation of Manners, as also the Black Roll of Prosecutions, London, 1693-4.

The attempt thus to raise the tone of contemporary life by a direct attack on the results of evil principles had little effect: complaint is made in a report of 1694 of the 'encouragement of vice by the generality of the people.' The clerical support came chiefly from Low Churchmen, and the movement was definitely Whig in political outlook. Societies existed in Edinburgh, in Dublin, and in nearly every large town in England. An account of their work was translated into French and German, and copies were sent to Switzerland, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and to the Plantations in America.

In the Library of Congress in Washington, D. C., may be seen a rare broadsheet on which is printed a proclamation made in April, 1693, in pursuance of 'their Majesties' gracious commands' for the encouragement of virtue and good living and the discouragement of vice. The breaking of the Lord's Day, 'prophane swearing, cursing, drunkenness, idleness and unlawful gaming, and all manner of prophaneness whatsoever,' are strictly prohibited, and the Justices of the Peace, the Sheriffs, and the constables are required duly to enforce the existing laws against vice.

The death of the Queen in 1694, which robbed the societies of the prestige which royal support had given to them, was a severe blow, but they lasted, as a more or less effective social force well into the eighteenth century. 'The Queen's patronizing of these Endeavours could not but give Credit and Strength to them; so the affair, by her Death . . . must lose a great advantage. But yet the loss . . . did not discourage those that were ingaged in this Enterprise . . . tho' they were deprived of such a great Friend and Protector.'[62]

[62] An Account of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners, London, 1699.

CHAPTER EIGHT

PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

THE MEMOIRS of Queen Mary contain many expressions of the scorn that she felt for the society of which she had become the leader. Many of those by whom she was surrounded had been educated to mock at virtue and to exalt vice. It may be wondered what the rakes and libertines of Charles II's court thought of the sober and chaste lady, with her prayers and her sermons, her reading of good books and her doing of good works. Did Thomas Wharton, 'the most universal villain I ever knew,'[1] 'the scorn and wonder of our days,'[2] smile contemptuously when his correspondent James Vernon told him that the Queen, going one morning to seven o'clock prayers, 'took notice of the neglect of her servants in coming thither,' and directed that 'pecuniary mulcts' should in future be inflicted on those that were absent? Was there cynical amusement in the hearts of such men as Henry Sidney, supposed to have been drunk every day for years, and Monmouth, another notorious evil liver, when they heard of the Queen's exerting herself to reform the morals of the nation?

The men who surrounded the Queen were not all of this type, however. There was also the serious Lord Pembroke, who lived, so it was said, like a primitive Christian; there was Lord Dorset, a poet of no mean order, and the stern and dark Godolphin. For Carmarthen Mary had no liking, but for Nottingham, conscientious, industrious, and a devout Anglican, she always felt respect. 'Lord Nottingham seems to be very

[1] Works of Pope, ed. Warton, III. 194. [2] Swift, IX. 178.

hearty in all affairs . . . and appears to be sincere . . . I confess I am inclined to have a good opinion of him: it may be his formal grave look deceives me,' she wrote to William in the summer of 1690.

In spite of her onerous official duties, Mary was often the centre of a gay throng in her drawing room. 'I must see company upon my set days: I must play twice a week . . . I must laugh and talk though never so much against my will . . . I must grin when my heart is ready to break . . . and talk when my heart is so oppressed I can scarce breathe.'[3] She did well what she regarded as her social duty, even when suffering from anxiety and fatigue.

When the Jacobite Earl of Ailesbury surrendered himself on bail, he was treated with all distinction 'by the Queen's express command.' He sent his wife to offer thanks to her Majesty, and to express his regret that, as persons under bail were looked on as prisoners, he could not come in person. The Queen's answer was: 'Tell my Lord of Ailesbury that I love to do good to all persons . . . but more especially to him and his family, whom I knew so well in my youngest years, and therefore . . . I will break through the common forms, and direct him to come at four o'clock to-morrow afternoon.' The Earl records that she received him 'even beyond herself . . . The days were long and hot, and she played at basset until towards seven.' With a smiling countenance, she said: 'My Lord, you play at basset? I answered that I had used to play, but that prisoners were poor. She guessed well what I meant, and pointing to my Lord Colchester, and Mr. Maulle, who kept the bank "Your old friends hath money at your service" . . . The Queen from time

[3] Dalrymple's Memoirs, II, App. 2, p. 166.

to time was so gracious as to ask me many questions relating to myself and family.'[4]

From the frequent mention of basset in contemporary records, it might be supposed that the Queen did little else but play cards when freed from the cares of business, yet a visitor to Hampton Court a short time after her death admired in the 'Queen's Closet, the hangings, chairs, stooles and screen . . . all of satten stitch done in worsteds, beasts, birds, imagines and ffruits, all wrought very finely by Queen Mary and her maids of honour.'[5]

Dancing was also one of the amusements of the court, although the Queen thought often that such gaiety was unsuitable in a time of war. She frequently honoured her friends by dining with them. One of her visits, to Woburn, the home of Philip, Lord Wharton, caused more perturbation than pleasure, however. An account of it was sent a few days afterwards to Lady Rachel Russell: 'Yesterday, I found my lady very much out of humour, fretting at her having been surprised at this hay sevnight by the Queen who dined with her without giving der more than an hour and a half's notice.' On the Friday and Saturday there had been much company at Woburn, which 'had left the house so bare that she had great difficulty to contrive enuff for her family on the Sabbath day . . . Next morning Lord Wharton went to Windsor . . . and there found the Queen's coaches ready to carry her away to Woburn . . . He dispatched away a messenger that found poor Lady Wharton just sat down to her own dinner. 'Tis easier to imagine what her condition was . . . There was nothing in the house . . . She

[4] Memoirs of Ailesbury, I. 265.
[5] Through England on a Side-saddle, Celia Fiennes, p. 305.

sed if she would have given £5 for a partrige, 'twas not to be had. She had no cook . . . and my Lord Wharton had . . . so little presence of mind that he did not think of sending one from Windsor . . . Everything was out of order, and the Queen, whom my Lady had never seen, was just at the door . . . to hear my Lady . . . tell the tragical story would almost have made one cry . . . yet she was very well pleased with the honour the Queen did her . . . The Queen dined three miles of us last Saturday at the Duchess of Monmouth's, where the entertainment . . . was very splendid.'[6]

Although Lady Rachel Russell was seldom at court, Mary, who always paid a spontaneous tribute to nobility of character and distinction of personality, felt for her a cordial and even affectionate regard. In Holland she had admired the fortitude with which Lady Rachel bore her sorrow.

Friendly sympathy was also shown by the Queen to those of her friends whose husbands were taking part in the war. She wrote 'at 12 at night' just after the Battle of Steinkirke in July, 1692, to the Countess of Scarborough: 'The first I asked after when the news of the batle came was your Lord, and finding him not mentioned in any of the leters, take it for the best sign, for ther is an exact account come . . . All the Lieutenants of the Gards who are either wounded or kild, by which tho you shoud hapen to have no leter, yet you may be sure he is well . . . I thank God the King is so, though we have got no victory, yet the French have had an equal losse, so that they need not brag . . . Your afectionate kind friend, Marie R. The batle was fought Sunday last from 9 till 6.'[7] A letter dictated by the same kindly spirit was sent to the Duchess of Ormonde

[6] Hist. MSS Comm., Rutland, II. 131. [7] Brit. Mus. Add. 20731, f. 6.

in August, 1693, assuring her that the King would take all the care he could 'to procure the liberty of the Duke before any other person . . . I am very glad that I can give so good an account and hope the Duchesse of Ormonde will do me the justice to believe that nobody can rejoice more heartily than I do with her.'[8]

Mary's idealism was not of the destructive kind that has no contact with reality. It would be a mistake to suppose that life at court after the Revolution completely lost its former gaiety and brilliance. The Queen's desire to purify the morals of her age was no doubt supported by the men and women of honour who had hidden themselves in the country during the preceding reigns to avoid the pollution of London society, but those still frequented the salons who will always be a byword in English history for vicious and debauched character. Personalities do not change because of the presence of one, even if she be a Queen. Disreputable amours continued; the love of play was not checked; and the intrigues of those given over to lawlessness and lust went on very near to the person of the Queen. She did not hold herself aloof from the society in which she found herself, although for many of its members she could feel no respect.

In the absences of William, however, she was a very lonely woman. The relationships subsisting between the two royal sisters were not what they should have been, owing to the insidious influence of Lady Marlborough. Goodwin Wharton records in language which cannot be paraphrased, an episode that occurred at the end of 1690: 'The Queen fails of no opportunity of showing her friendship, and the Princess en-

[8] Ibid. Add. 28, 878, f. 116.

creaseth in showing a passion so far that once upon my coming into the drawing room, she being with the Queen, she rose up from cards on a sudden, not without being observed by the Queen particularly, and left her, and after which endeavoured on all occasions to show me the meaning of her heart by her eye.'[9] It cannot be supposed that Anne was guilty of such bad taste as to attempt a flirtation with the author of this passage! If Mr. Wharton's words correctly convey the significance of the scene, she was allowing herself to be used for the purpose of some petty political intrigue. Anne had often displayed a scorn of her sister's actions: 'She laughed at afternoon sermons, and did in little things contrary to what I did.' Their living 'uneasily together . . . might have proved dangerous to the public affairs of the nation in making a party.'[10] Anne was the only person to whom Mary might have given expression to the dread and fear that so often oppressed her spirit during the absences of William. She often refers with a sad wistfulness to Anne's continued coldness.

Mary's Memoirs open for the year 1692 with the words: 'This year began with family troubles of mine . . . I heard much from all hands of my sister . . . whether she was wronged or not I cannot judge . . . probably Lord Marlborough was so sure of the Prince and she when he would that 'tis not likely he would acquaint them so far at first.'[11] After Lord Marlborough's disgrace, William and Mary naturally expected Anne to discuss with them the question of his wife's continued attendance upon her, but her Ladyship escorted Anne to her sister's drawing room,—in Mary's words, 'the strangest thing

[9] Brit. Mus. Add. 20, 006-7. [10] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, p. 24.
[11] Ibid., p. 45.

that ever was done.' On the following day the Queen commanded the dismissal of Lady Marlborough; 'never anybody was suffered to live at court in my Lord Marlborough's circumstances. I need not repeat the cause he has given the King to do what he has done . . . I hope you will do me the justice to believe it is . . . much against my will that I now tell you that after this it is very unfit Lady Marlborough should stay with you . . . I tell you plainly Lady Marlborough must not continue with you in the circumstances her Lord is.' Then, referring to Lady Marlborough's appearance in her drawing room: 'It was very unkind in a sister, would have been uncivil in an equal, and I need not say I have more to claim, which, though my kindness would make me never exact, yet when I see the use you would make of it, I must tell you that I know what is due to me, and expect to have it from you.' This simple and dignified phrasing reveals Mary the Queen. Then come tender sisterly appeals and assurances of affectionate regard: 'I know all this will be uneasy to you, and I am sorry for it . . . I have all the real kindness imaginable for you, and as I ever have, will always do my part to live with you as sisters ought. That is, not only like so near relations, but like friends . . . I do love you as my sister, and nothing but yourself can make me do otherwise.' Mary then reveals her eager hope of a ready acquiescence on the part of Anne by saying: 'I shall come to your drawing-room to-morrow before you play, because you know why I cannot make one . . . nor will I ever be by choice but your truly loving and affectionate sister.'[12]

Anne's answer to this letter was couched in such terms that Lord Rochester refused to be its bearer. The response that it

[12] The Conduct of the Duchess of Marlborough, p. 24f.

evoked was a command through Lord Nottingham that Lady Marlborough should at once leave the Cockpit. Now all the tender sentimentalities of Anne's nature found full expression. In what terms of passionate loyalty did she assure the devoted Lady Marlborough of her undying affection! How her gentle heart recoiled from hurting one so faithful! And how much she admired the sentiments she herself so fervently uttered! And Lady Marlborough responded in terms befitting one who is conscious of the honour bestowed upon her by a friendship which transcended all barriers of rank, even to the sacrifice of the claims of sisterly relationship. Anne decided to leave the precincts of Whitehall when Lady Sarah obeyed the royal command, and asked the Duke and Duchess of Somerset for the loan of Sion House. William, wishing to prevent an open rupture, asked the Duke not to accede to her request, but in this Anne was to have her way. Before retiring to Sion, at the beginning of March, however, Anne visited the Queen's drawing room, 'making all the professions that could be imagined.' The worldly wisdom of Lady Marlborough thus manifested itself again. Mary was no sentimentalist, however, and she merely reiterated the terms on which Anne could be once more received into favour.

Upon the birth of a child to Anne in April, and the announcement that was made to the Queen that her sister 'was much worse than she used to be,' Mary visited her. The Queen's very presence in Anne's dwelling was of the nature of a gracious and friendly overture, but there was to be no mistake on the question of the Marlboroughs; 'I have made the first step by coming to see you, and I now expect that you should make the

next by removing Lady Marlborough.'[13] At Anne's reply that such a request was unreasonable, Mary, without expressing solicitude for Anne's health, rose up and departed. At the end of May, Anne made some suggestion that she might remain at the Cockpit if Mary 'made it easy for her.' The Queen's answer, which Lady Sarah called 'harsh and peremptory,' should be given in full: 'I have received your's by the Bishop of Worcester, and have very little to say to it. Since you cannot but know that as I have never used compliments, so now they will not serve. 'Tis none of my fault that we live at this distance, and I have endeavoured to show my willingness to do otherwise, and I will do no more. Don't give yourself any unnecessary trouble; for be assured it is not words that can make us live together as we ought. You know what I required of you, and I now tell you, if you doubted it before, that I cannot change my mind, but expect to be complied with, or you must not wonder if I doubt of your kindness. You can give me no other marks that can satisfy me. Nor can I put any other constructions upon your actions than what all the world must do that sees them. These things don't hinder me being very glad you are so well, and wishing you may continue so; and that you may yet, while 'tis in your power, oblige me to be your affectionate sister, Marie R.'[14]

Instructions were then given that no ladies were to visit Anne, that her guards were to be removed, and that she was not to receive any of the usual marks of homage given to members of the royal family. Anne, taking advantage of a rumour that was circulating in her household that the Queen would

[13] The Conduct of the Duchess of Marlborough, p. 38.
[14] Ibid., p. 42.

be willing to accept, as a submission to her will, a temporary separation from Lady Sarah, sent a message that she would be willing to give her Majesty 'any satisfaction of that sort.' Mary fell into 'a great passion' and said that she would never see her sister upon any other terms than the dismissal of Lady Marlborough, not for a time but for ever, repeating more than once: 'I am a Queen, and will be obeyed.'[15]

Mary's letter to her sister may well be compared with the references she made to the episode in the Memoirs which were intended for no eyes but her own. 'When Lord Marlboro' was put out, and she was told in all the gentle and kind wais that could be thought on that she must part with his Lady,' she showed 'so much indifference and coldness to me that it really went to my heart. But when I saw that no kindness could work upon her . . . and that I did what I could towards a reconciliation without effect, it made me change quite and grow (at least endeavour to grow) as indifferent as she. But in all this I see the hand of God, and look on our disagreeing as a punishment upon us for the irregularity by us committed upon the revolution. My husband did his duty, and the nation did theirs, and we were to suffer it, and rejoice that it pleased God to do what he did. But as to owr persons, it is not as it ought to be, tho' it was unavoidable . . . no doubt . . . it is a just judgment of God, but I trust the Church and Nation shall not suffer, but that we in owr private concerns and persons may bear the punishment as in this we do.'[16] The sisters had gone 'against nature' at the Revolution, and this breach was to be regarded as their punishment. To such a conclusion did Mary's quaint moralising lead her. Her Memoirs end for the year 1692 with

[15] Ibid., pp. 54 f. [16] Memoirs, ed. Doebner, pp. 45 f.

a sad reference to the breach as 'a very great blow,' though not to be compared to the military disappointments and the neglect of the opportunities offered by the victory of La Hogue.

Apart from her sore need of her sister's friendship, Mary was wise enough to see that dissensions between them would be at once taken advantage of by the 'disaffected' for purposes of political intrigue. The Jacobite, Sir James Montgomery, in his Report on the state of Political Parties to James VII in 1693 remarks that 'the difference betwixt the two sisters is of use,'[17] and in Parliament at the end of 1692 it was proposed that the House should take cognisance of the 'misunderstanding between the Queen and the Princess Anne.'[18] There is no evidence that serious difficulties were caused to the government by the rupture, but it might have been otherwise, had it not been for the change in the political situation after La Hogue.

The estrangement from her sister sorely tried the Queen, but the knowledge of her husband's infidelity was a constant grief. In spite of it, however, her affection and loyalty to him never wavered. The letters written to William during his absence in Ireland prove indeed that Mary passionately loved her husband: but may not the criticism be made that a wife whose husband has perfect confidence in her affection does not express herself in extravagant language, even when parted in such circumstances as those of 1690? The security of William's position in England depended to a very large extent upon her, and she was probably aware that the knowledge of it rankled; it is at least likely that, because of her love for him, she gave him what she knew his pride demanded. Her Memoirs betray the care with which she avoided any appearance of

[17] The Melvills and the Leslies, Sir W. Fraser, III. 233. [18] Ranke, VI. 184.

interest in business when William was in England; it is true that she was always glad to be spared its irksome detail, but something actually caused her to be 'afraid ever to speack to the Lord President or Lord Nottingham,' lest 'people' should think she still 'affected it.' By 'people' she probably meant William, although there is the further consideration that the Regency Bill only empowered her to control administration in his absence.

What was the effect upon her relationships with her husband of her taking an active part in administration? 'I . . . must not forget to observe how kind the King is, how much more of his company I have had . . . than I used to have,' she wrote in her Memoirs. The proof she was giving of her capacity doubtless increased William's respect for his wife. Her self-abnegation, which made possible an identity of purpose and interest, brought to her its reward, but it was only the grief caused by her death that made William break from the Villiers entanglement.

At the beginnning of April, 1694, Mary, who was then but thirty-two years old, wrote to a Dutch friend: 'Je crois que je deviens vieille, et les infirmites viennant avec l'age ou avec le chagrin et les inquiétudes qu'on a si regulièrement tous les estes; mais quoique ce soit, c'est la volonté de Dieu et il faut se soumettre.'[19] The stress which had ennobled her spirit had gradually lessened the vitality of her body. During 1694 she had less direct contact with affairs; it may be that her consciousness of physical weakness was the cause. Burnet records that she felt once or twice such indispositions upon her that she thought nature must be working towards some great sickness. The death of the Archbishop of Canterbury at the be-

[19] Lettres et Memoires, ed. Bentinck, p. 146.

ginning of December much affected her, for she loved the mild and gentle-natured Tillotson. She spoke of him to Burnet 'in the tenderest manner, and not without tears.' Very soon afterwards the dread symptoms of small-pox appeared, and it was known that the Queen's life was in great danger. She destroyed many of her letters, meditations, and journals, and then prepared, doubtless with gratitude and relief, to go from the life which had brought her little but sorrow. 'She only was calm, when all was in a storm about her.'[20]

William's anguish was uncontrolled. The bishops and the members of the household, themselves deeply affected, were amazed at his unrestrained grief. He summoned Burnet, and gave 'a free vent to a most tender passion . . . he burst out into tears . . . there was no hope of the Queen . . . from being the happiest, he was now going to be the miserablest creature upon earth . . . he had never known one single fault in her . . . there was a worth in her that nobody knew besides himself.'[21] Death freed the Queen in the early morning of the 28th December. 'She was the most universally lamented Princess . . . of any in our age or in our history.'[22]

[20] Memorial of Mary, Burnet, p. 77.
[21] History of My Own Times, IV. 247.
[22] Ibid., IV. 248.

CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSION

THE HISTORICAL events which conditioned the course of Queen Mary's life were international in their scope. She was more than an actor in a drama which was to defend the English people from the absolutism of a misguided King and to preserve their Protestant faith. The aim of Louis XIV, which was nothing less than the expansion and consolidation of French dominion in Europe, threatened the total destruction of the balance of power, which then seemed necessary for the very existence of the States of Europe. With James II firmly reëstablished on the English throne by the good offices of Louis, and the chief leaders of the 'late rebellion' in the Tower, or in their graves, Louis would be able to face his enemies, of whom the chief was William of Orange, without fear. On what befell the House of Stuart depended the fate of Europe.

William of Orange had realised the importance of England in this great international conflict. In his war with Louis, which involved facing the French armies in the territory in the Spanish Netherlands which adjoined France, and after 1688, the defence of the channels separating Ireland from Great Britain, and the latter from France, the English fleet and army might prove decisive factors.

Mary probably did not realise fully the importance of the historical events of which she was the centre. To her the conflict presented itself as mainly a religious one,—to save Protestantism for England. The significance of her life as a historical personage lies in the fact that she made possible not only

William's accession to the English throne, but his retention of it, which led finally to the defeat of Louis' ambitions in Europe and beyond. A recent writer has said: 'The new King [William] had been created in men's sight by men, not by God, and coronation without birthright could make him at best a candle that tried to replace a sun.' The sun was shining at his side. To the gentle personality of Mary was directed the sentiment of attachment to a dynasty as the symbol of English aspiration and English achievement. With the thought of her was the imaginative association in the minds of English people of the great deeds of a long line of English Kings and Queens. That Mary was an English Princess was all important.

How then can we reconcile with these facts that, during her reign, she was constantly in fear of Jacobite rebellion, and that evidence of Jacobite intrigue against her government was frequently discovered? The dangers of Jacobitism and the need of wisely dealing with them formed a large part of Mary's experience as Queen, but after the expiration of two hundred and fifty years we are able to place these dangers in their true perspective. Both Danby and Halifax, in 1689, considered that the odds were then great against the permanence of the new régime. Ireland in arms, Scotland rising in the north, the Whigs in rebellion in England and Scotland, grave financial difficulties, corruption and chaos in the administration of the navy, and lastly, William's unattractive personality—these facts made it seem as though James might yet come back. Louis had made, as a condition of helping James to land in England, the stipulation that there should first be a rising in his interest there. There were plots and rumours of plots. It has not been considered necessary, even if it were possible, fully to relate their

history. To what cause may be assigned their failure before the victory of La Hogue in May, 1692? Not to any uncanny wisdom on the part of Queen Mary: the facts revealed to her by the Scottish conspirators in 1690 were already known to the government; but to the fact that the patriotic sentiment of Englishmen had been slowly withdrawn from James by reason of his incredible stupidity, and had centred around the personality of his daughter, particularly after she became more than a Queen in name. The dangers of Jacobitism were serious before the victory of La Hogue; the new constitutional settlement might have been merely an experiment but for the presence of Queen Mary at the centre of the government.

La Hogue brought to England the command of the Channel. So long as Louis insisted upon a Jacobite rising as a necessary preliminary to an invasion by James, the Revolution Settlement was safe. In addition to the consideration that Queen Mary was becoming truly representative of the popular will, there could be no successful rebellion of Jacobites in England when it was possible for English ships to prevent communication with France. When James II watched, with patriotic admiration, the burning of the French ships in the harbour of La Hogue by the English, he little knew that he was witnessing an event that symbolised the doom of his cause. The fact that La Hogue removed any serious danger of Jacobite rebellion in England for the time was probably not so apparent to contemporaries as it is to later students of this period.

The constitutional position of Queen Mary was unique. It stands as one of the most flagrant cases of sex disability in history. The regal power was vested in the King and Queen, one sovereign power in two persons, but the King alone was to

exercise it. She was Queen, but she could not be allowed to use her prerogative. When the problem of administration in William's absence was faced, it was only after a long debate that a reasonable solution was discovered: the Queen must be allowed to exercise regal power,—but the King must not be disentitled during his absence from a similar exercise. So there was the curious constitutional situation of a King and a Queen separated for months at a time by sea and land, with constant fear of interrupted communications, each able to wield executive power, and to take part in administration. The dangers to a country in circumstances such as those of 1690 to 1694, at war with a great power, in fear of internal rebellion, and with disloyal and dishonourable statesmen as advisers to the Queen, are obvious. Might it not have been expected that a much wronged wife, under guise of duty to a father, would play into the hands of Jacobites and non-jurors, and defeat the dearest plans of her husband? Or might not that injured wife, insulted always by the presence of Elizabeth Villiers at her Court, have seized any opportunity for revenge, and have conspired to gain sovereignty for herself alone? That, for Mary, might have proved an easy task. Or, was there not the third possibility that her strongly religious temperament would have forced her to make response to the fervent appeal sent by Bishop Ken in April, 1692: 'I most humbly I most importunately beg of you to consider that the dutys you owe to a Husband, to a Ffather, and to a brother are not at all inconsistent, that the duty you owe to God is superior to them all, that no one command of God is to be violated to gratify either, that such a violation is a publick scandall to our Christianity, that no evill is to be done to promote our most holy religion, and that there

can be no true repentance without Restitution.'[1] Why did not Mary abdicate in the absence of her husband, on the eve of La Hogue? Would the battle have been fought, or would James have been invited to return peacefully to his kingdom? Posterity perhaps owes more to Queen Mary for the acts that she refrained from than for those which she performed.

In our attempt to present a single and harmonious portrait of Mary, expressing her personality both as woman and as Queen, we may spare a few words to describe her physical characteristics. Strong emotions, good intellectual powers, and much sensitiveness are revealed by a study of contemporary portraits. She had an oval face, with a wide expansive brow, surrounded by curling tendrils of dark hair. Her mouth was large, with the generous curves of full but firm lips. Her eyes were dark and clear, with straight brows. The sensitiveness of her nature is revealed by her fingers, of a delicate tapering shape.

If we think of her moving about the old Palace at Whitehall, surrounded by her bewigged courtiers, obsequious but untrustworthy; or alone in her chamber, bending over her gilt-leaved notebook of 'blew turky leathere' trying to gain relief for her overburdened heart by committing its secrets to paper; or entering the cabinet council room with gracious gesture and smiling face to discuss very earnestly matters of urgent importance to the nation, such as the proclamation of her father, James II, to his rebellious subjects on the eve of La Hogue in 1692; or reading the impassioned letter of Bishop Ken, once her dearly loved friend, which was really a most moving plea

[1] Plumptre's Life of Ken, I. 304-9.

for her own abdication, we shall realise more fully the tragedy of her life of Queen as England.

What characteristics may be looked for in a Queen who successfully conducted herself in so unique and remarkable a position? One reply to this question might be, that Queen Mary was sensible and reasonable, and these qualities saved her from serious mistakes. Another might stress the fact of her love for William: she, this descendant of the Stuarts, was overwhelmed and dominated completely by sex emotion, which made her amenable always to the strong will of her husband. Such a reply ignores a quality that Mary undoubtedly possessed—that of intelligence—and is therefore defective. She had an inheritance which was not merely that of the Stuart kings; one grandfather was the unhappy and unfortunate Charles I, it is true; but the other was Clarendon, the lawyer and historian. Her resolution to identify herself with William's purposes on his coming to England came as a result of thought: there was a careful weighing in the balance of values in a time of serious and profound meditation. It may be argued that Mary's obliteration of her own rights as against those of her husband, of which there is so much evidence, is further proof that she was dominated by her love for him. It might be more true to say that this obliteration occurred because Mary regarded her husband as an instrument to effect a very high purpose. Nearly all women in the seventeenth century were inarticulate, and the words they said and wrote expressed but feebly their personalities. Mary had what in modern parlance is termed a sense of service to the state and to society. She believed that William was acting for the public good and for the good of the Church, and this was the cause of her complete identification of her will with his. Her life was in harmony with

certain great abstract and impersonal forces that were conditioning historical events in her age. Her greatness lies in the fact that she might have proved, if only temporarily, an obstruction to the onward rush of these forces, but instead identified herself with them. She was able to do this because she had unified her own personality, and the unifying force was religion.

It may be argued, and with some truth, that religion to her at first was merely what the psychologists call a compensatory phantasy. Later, however, in response to the circumstances of her life in Holland, her character deepened and matured very quickly, and as her intellect strengthened, and the spiritual powers of her nature grew, her religion expressed itself, not only in pious meditations, but in action. Monsieur Peter Jurieu, one of the ministers at the French church at Amsterdam, in his Pastoral Letter on the Death of the Queen refers to her thus: 'Her great Soul was never put to a harder Trial than on the occasion of the Revolution in England, and Her Wisdom never appeared with a greater lustre. Never was there a nicer juncture for a truly Christain Soul, for a wife that was still a Lover, and a daughter deeply sensible of her Duty. I know some persons to whom she then did the honour to discover the bottom of her Soul, which was agitated by so many troublesome, different, and even contrary Motions; where the Husband and the Father were contending together in that Tender Heart, which became the field of all their Battels. But it may truly be said that she disengaged herself out of all these perplexing circumstances in an admirable manner. And that she sacrificed her Love, her Quiet, and her Tenderness, to her Zeal to Her God, to the Publick, and to her Religion.'[2]

[2] Bodl. Pamph. 220.

Character is more than achievement, but the latter is important in the life of a monarch. There is nothing startling or picturesque to record of Queen Mary's activities. She displayed no remarkable insight into problems that baffled politicians and naval experts: she initiated no movement that was far-reaching and dramatic in effect; but she grappled courageously with dull business routine, she presided early and late at meetings of her cabinet and council, and never exercised a self-willed authority which might have hindered if it did not actually defeat the true interests of her country. She exhibited fortitude in times of stress, when her heart was full of sorrow. Her greatest work was perhaps one which no records can reveal: she had the woman's power of subtle and delicate response to a psychological situation, and there must have been many occasions, when fierce party feeling and the dread of the treachery of Jacobitism created in naval and political deliberations difficulties which were removed by her intuitive and sympathetic understanding. Again to quote from Monsieur Jurieu: 'While He commanded Armies on our Frontiers . . . the Queen supplied his place on the Throne; She assisted at her Council four or five hours together, answered all proposals with admirable Presence of Mind, and with a piercing clearness of Judgment unfolded the most Knotty difficulties . . . The Queen watches, labours night and day, takes her measures, prevents the Conspirators, sees that Fleet dispersed which came to put her in chains, and like a Rock remains unmoved in the midst of so furious a Tempest.'[3] We like better Nottingham's sober words: 'We have owed our safety more than Once to the Queen's care and Vigilancy.'[4]

[3] Bodl. Pamph. 220, pp. 14-22. [4] Ibid., p. 21.

It would be possible to quote from many pulpit utterances in praise of Queen Mary, or to refer to poetic expressions of her virtues; but the simple statements in letters written by some of those with whom she had worked and lived give a greater impression of sincerity. We will quote from one of these, a letter written by Anne, the Countess of Nottingham, one of the Queen's ladies: 'God has been pleased to shorten her days as a reward of her sufferings, which in this world were not slight, and which, with the goodness of her own nature, had formed in her so great a degree of vertu it might truly be said the world was not worthy of her.'[5]

The Earl of Ailesbury, who had known her from childhood, esteemed her as a Princess who had no fault. 'She was a good wife (whether she had suitable returns I question much) submitted patiently, but had her anxieties of mind continually upon her . . . Dr. Tillotson and Burnet . . . infused into her texts of scripture adapted to their purpose, as husband and wife are but one flesh so may quit father and mother . . . she was wise and prudent, and well foresaw fatal consequences that might have attended her in case of a refusal, so outwardly she submitted, but God knows what she suffered inwardly and to a high degree . . . she was endued with all noble qualities both towards God . . . and towards Man.'[6]

It was through no fear of 'fatal consequences' that the Princess of Orange allowed herself to be made the Queen of England: her acceptance of the crown was the selfless act of a dedicated spirit.

[5] Brit. Mus. Add. 29,596. f. 171. [6] Memories of Ailesbury, I. 299.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER ONE

Extracts from the Letters that the Princess of Orange wrote to her father in defence of Protestantism:

Je supplie cependant V.M. de croire que ce n'est nullement un point d'honneur qui me rend ferme dans ma religion. J'ay une grande obligation à ceux de l'Église Anglicane qui ont pris soin de moy avant que j'aye quitée l'Angleterre pour m'instruire dans la Religion qu'on y professe. . . .

J étois jeune lorsque je quittois mon Païs, mais toute fois je ne laissay point en arrière l' envie d'être bien informée, ny les moyens d'y parvenir. Je me pourvû de livres and j'avois auprès de moy ceux qui étoient capables d'éclaircir les doutes que je pouvois avoir. Je n'étois ny d'humeur, ny n'avois este instruite à croire par autruy, ayant trouvé dans l'Ecriture Ste. que je devois m'employer moy-même à mon salut avec crainte et tremblement, et que chacun devoit rendre compte de ses oeuvres; je pensois donc être de mon devoir, d'avoir moy-même soin de mon âme, et je louè Dieu que par sa grâce je me vois si bien instruite et satisfaite, que je ne suis Protestante non pour avoir été élevée tolle, mais parce que je suis persuadée par mon propre jugement d'être dans le droit chemin.

Ce seroit une trop grande présomption à moy, de prétendre vouloir deffendre notre Réformation . . . je diray seulement cecy, que l'Église Anglicane a l'advantage de n'avoir rien fait tumultuairement, mais tout a été procedé selon les loix, et s'est établie ainsi. Quant à l'infaillibilité de l'Église Romaine je n'ay jamais entendu qu'il fut décidé, même par les Catholiques Romains en quoy elle consiste, et il reste en dispute si elle est dans le Pape seul, ou dans un Concile général, ou bien dans tous les deux ensemble, et j'espère que V.M. voudra me permettre à demander ou elle était, lorsqu' il y avoit quelquefois trois Papes en même temps . . . . On n'a pas besoin à lire beaucoup l'histoire, pour trouver que tous les Papes n'ont point étés guidés par le St. Esprit, et je ne sçai pas, si pour lors ils ont néantmoins continués d'être successeurs de St. Pierre, quand leurs vies étoient si ouvertement opposées à sa doctrine . . . l'Église Romaine d'à présent est si différente de l'Église primitive, que, tous ceux du party de la dérnière nommée sont bien aise de se séparer de l'autre.

Je pourrois faire mention de plusieurs passages de l'Ecriture Ste . . . mai je serays trop long; tout ce que j'ajouteroy est que Dieu nous crée pour être créatures raisonables, veut asseurement que nous mettions en usage la raison donnée, en matière de Religion. Car bien que notre foy soit au dessus de notre faison, elle n'y est pourtant nullement contraire . . .

L'Église Anglicane ne fait certainement nulle prétension a l'infaillibilité, mais elle est très malheureuse qu'on mette à sa charge toutes les persécutions employées contre les Nonconformistes, lorsqu'il est notoire que toutes ces loix sévères ont été faites pour des crimes d'état, et que le Gouvernement et non pas l'église qui les a juges necessaires. Depuis la Reformation les adversaires ont tousjours fait leur etude à faire naître des dissensions parmi nous, et malheureusement ils n'ont que trop bien réussi.

Mais je crains d'ennuyer votre Majesté, c'est pourquoi à toutes les difficultés qu'il propose dans l'Examen de la Religion, au sujet des femmes et des ignorants, je répondray brièvement sur l'un et l'autre de ces articles . . . Il est certain, que nous ne sommes point de la capacité d'étudier autant que les sçavants, cependent il est tout aussi certain, que nous devons connoître notre Religion, et que nos âmes sont aussi précieuses aux yeux de Dieu que celle de plus sages, car devant Luy il n'y a point d'égard pour les personnes . . . par so misericorde il nous a laissez une Parole écrite qui est claire et nette, et bien que les sages et les sçavants y puissent trouver des distinctions raffinées, nous autres ignorants ne le faisons point.

Et comme j'ay entrepris de répondre seulement pour les ignorants je ne veux point prendre la place des sçavans en répondant aux citations et passages des Pères. Je ne prétendray jamais à plus de connoissance que je n'ay; mais j'ay lu des livres écrits par dea hommes sçavants, qui pourront repondre à chaque passage du sien.

(*Lettres & Memoires de Marie Reine d'Angleterre*, Comtesse Bentinck, pp. 10-24.)

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER FOUR

We, Your Majesties most Dutiful and Loyal Subjects, and Servants, Flag Officers and Captains in your Majesty's fleet, out of the deep and grateful sense we have of your Majesty's good and just opinion of our loyalty and

fidelity, imparted to us by the right Hon. Admiral Russell, in a letter to him from my Lord Nottingham, do, in the behalf of ourselves, and all the other officers and seamen, humbly presume to address ourselves to your Majesty at this juncture, to undeceive the world in these false and malicious reports that have been lately spread in prejudice of your Majesty's service, by people of an unreasonable disaffection to your Majesty's government, and an obstinate aversion to the quiet and good of our country, that there are some amongst us that are not truly zealous for and entirely devoted to your Majesty's service. We do therefore most humbly beg your Majesty's leave to add to our repeated oaths this assurance of our fidelity, that we will, with all imaginable alacrity and resolution, venture our lives in defence of your Majesty's undoubted rights and the liberty and religion of our country, against all foreign and popish invaders whatsoever.

Dated on Board the Britannia. 15th May. 1692.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER SIX

1. *The letter which Bishop Ken addressed to Madam Jessen but intended for the Queen:*

If my service is any way acceptable to yr Excellent Mistris (for such she is in her native and unblended disposition) I entreat you to lay it at her feet . . . she will find at the long run, that those very persons who pretend ye most reall concerne for her service, will at ye first appearance of danger, wholly abandon her. I dread to thinke that there is any probability of my living to see our Mistris calamitous, and I earnestly beseech God to be propitious to her, to direct her ye right way, and to guard her from evill Counsellors, from treacherous flatterers, from Unchristian Casuists, from all Unnaturall Opposition to her most tender and Royall father, whenever he returns to assert his right, and from ye guilt of all ye bloodshed wch will be ye unavoidable consequence of such an opposition . . . I doe with a bleeding heart deplore ye condition in which I now apprehend yr Mistris to be, and I humbly beg God to open her eyes yt she may see in this her day, a Day wch I fear is very short, and will soon be irrevocable, ye things which belong to her peace, lest they be hid from her eyes . . . If my Zeale has transported me, 'tis from

no temporall motive, but from a sincere and most affectionate desire of my Mistresses happiness in this world, and in ye world to come, wch has occasioned this excursion, and wch, at ye worst, is, I hope, veniall.'

2. *The letter which he afterwards addressed to the Queen:*

Being inexpressibly Zealous and Solicitous for your Good, I presume to write to you myselfe. I do not give you ye title of Majesty, not daring to do it . . . My encouragement to make this addresse to you is ye persuasion wch possesses me, yt that you have of late acted from an Intention wch is rather misguided than willfully evil, and ye entire confidence I have of your wisdome, and ye Goodnesse of your nature wch will be better pleased with sincereity than with flattery . . . having had ye honour to have been your servant, and to have received particular markes of your favour . . . my worldly interest and my owne naturall inclination for ye service of so gratious a mistris, whose Happiness temporall as well as Eternall, I always most passionately desired, would from ye beginning have very readily determined me to have followed all your measures, but my conscience would not permit me to comply . . . I had rather suffer your utmost severity than be disregardfull of your wellfare at such a time as this, when ye probable apprehension of danger may . . . soften you into relenting and awaken those serious reflections wch success and prosperity, even in devout persons, are so apt to stifle and to lay asleep.

Madam, I most humbly, I most importunately beg of you to consider yt ye dutys you owe to a Husband, to a ffather and to a brother, are not at all inconsistent, yt ye duty you owe to God is superior to them all, yt no one command of God is to be violated to gratify either, that such a violation is a publick scandall to our christianity, yt no evill is to be done to promote our most holy religion, yt there can be no true Repentance without Restitution, yt if King James once sets up his standard in his kingdom, ye arguments now urged against him will then all turne for him, and be generally urged on his side, yt you yourselfe will tremble at ye thoughts of drawing ye sword against your own Royall Father and against God's Anointed . . . I will gladly sacrifice my life to heale those wounds wch you yourselfe have given to your own Conscience . . . God out of ye multitude of His most tender mercys give you grace to weep much, to love much, and withall to be much beloved by God.

(Plumptre's *Life of Ken*, II. 304-9).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Sources

Bodleian Library: Rawlinson MSS, Carte MSS, Tanner MSS, Ballard MSS.

British Museum: Additional MSS.—(Bentinck Letters; Letters of William to Heinsius; Autobiography of Goodwin Wharton; Nottingham-Hatton Correspondence; Letters of Queen Mary), Birch MSS, Harleian MSS, Stowe MSS.

Public Record Office: Privy Council Register, Finch Manuscripts (placed there for the use of the Historical MSS Commission).

Reports of the Historical MSS Commission: Bucclough-Whitehall MSS, Denbigh MSS, Downshire MSS, Dartmouth MSS, Finch MSS, Le Fleming MSS, Graham MSS, Johnstone MSS, Kenyon MSS, Morrison MSS, Portland MSS, Rutland MSS, Shrewsbury MSS.

State Papers: House of Lords Manuscripts (Hist. MSS Com.), Journals of the House of Commons, Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Calendar of State Papers America.

Contemporary Sources

A

Memoirs and Letters of Mary, Queen of England, ed. by Dr. R. Doebner. Leipzig, 1886.

Lettres et Memoires de Marie, Reine d'Angleterre, ed. by Countess M. Van Bentinck. La Haye, 1880.

Mary's letters to William, in Dalrymple's Memoirs. London, 1790.

Letters of Two Queens, ed. by Col. B. Bathurst. London, 1924.

History of My Own Times, Gilbert Burnet. Oxford, 1833.

Supplement to Burnet's History of My Own Times, by Miss H. C. Foxcroft. Oxford, 1902.

Essay on the Memory of the Late Queen, Gilbert Burnet. Dublin, 1695.

Memorial of Mary, Princess of Orange, Gilbert Burnet. Edinburgh, 1842.

B

Abbadie, Jacques: Panegyric on the Late Queen. London, 1695. (Bodl. Pamph. 220).

Thomas, Second Earl of Ailesbury: Memoirs of. Westminister (Roxburgh Club), 1890.

Allyn, Rev. R.: Narrative of the Victory. London, 1744.

Avaux, Jean Antoine de Mesmes, Comte d': Negociations en Hollande. Paris, 1752-3.

Memoirs of Monsieur de B. Gravenhage, 1898.

Colin, Earl of Balcarres: Memoirs touching the Revolution in Scotland, 1688-90. Edinburgh (Bannatyne Club), 1841.

Burchett, Josiah: Transactions at Sea during the war with France. London, 1703.

Carstares, William: State Papers and Letters of, ed. by J. C. McCormick. Edinburgh, 1774.

Chamberlayne, E.: Angliae Notitia. London, 1694.

Clarke, J. C.: Life of James II. London, 1816.

Cobbett, William: Parliamentary History. London, 1806-12.

Coxe, William: Shrewsbury Correspondence. London, 1821.

Dalrymple, Sir John: Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland. London, 1790.

Echard, Laurence: History of England. London, 1707.

Firmin, Thomas: Late Citizen of London. Life of. London, 1698.

Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester: Memoir of Mary, Queen of England. (Bodl. Pamph. 220), London, 1712.

Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester: Vindication of an Undertaking. London 1692. (Bodl. Tanner 823).

Fraser, Sir William: The Melvilles and the Leslies. Edinburgh, 1890.

Fuller, William: Life of, by Himself. London, 1701.

Hill-Trevor: Life of William III; Dr. Hooper's Narrative in Appendix. London, 1835.

Papers Illustrative of the Highlands of Scotland. Glasgow (Maitland Club), 1854.

Hyde Correspondence, ed. by S. W. Singer. London, 1828.

Kemble, J. M.: State Papers and Correspondence Illustrative of the Social and Political State of Europe from the Revolution. London, 1857.

Kidder, R.: Life of Anthony Horneck. London, 1706.

Lake, Edward: Diary of. Camden Miscellany, Vol. I. London, 1847.

Leven and Melvill Papers. Edinburgh (Bannatyne Club), 1843.

Lowther, Sir John: Memoirs of. York, 1808.

LUTTRELL, NARCISSUS: Relation of State Affairs. Oxford, 1857.
MACPHERSON, JAMES: Original Papers. London, 1775.
Account of the Conduct of the Duchess of Marlborough. London, 1742.
MAZURE, F. A. J.: History of England. Paris, 1825.
MIEGE, GUY: New State of England. London, 1693.
PATRICK, BISHOP OF ELY: Autobiography of. Oxford, 1839.
PITTIS, W.: Life of Dr. Radcliffe. London, 1715.
RALPH, J.: The Other Side of the Question. London, 1742.
RAPIN-THOYRAS, PAUL DE: History of England. London, 1732.
RERESBY, SIR JOHN: Memoirs of. London, 1734.
RUSSELL, LADY RACHEL: Letters. Philadelphia, 1854.
SIDNEY, HENRY: Diary of, ed. by R. W. Blencowe. London, 1843.
TEMPLE, SIR WILLIAM: Memoirs of. London, 1714.
THORESBY, RALPH: Diary of. London, 1830.
Tudor and Stuart Proclamations.
WOODWARD, J.: An Account of the Rise and progress of the Religious Societies. London, 1701.

Authorities Not Contemporary

A

BIRCH, THOMAS: Life of J. Tillotson. London, 1752.
CLARKE, T. E., and FOXCROFT, H. C.: Life of Gilbert Burnet. Cambridge, 1907.
D'OYLY, G.: Life of William Sancroft. London, 1821.
GREW, MARION E.: Bentinck and William III. London, 1924.
MACAULAY, THOMAS B.: History of England. London, 1913.
PLUMPTRE, E. H.: Life of Bishop Ken. London, 1888.
SIR GEORGE SAVILLE, Bart., 1st Marquis of Halifax: Life and Letters, ed. by Miss H. C. Foxcroft. London, 1898.
STRICKLAND, AGNES: Lives of the Queens of England. London, 1840.
SHARPE, THOMAS: Life of Archbishop Sharpe. London, 1825.

B

BOWLES, WILLIAM L.: Life of Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells. London, 1830.
COLOMB, PHILIP HOWARD: Naval Warfare. London, 1899.
CORBETT, J.: England in the Mediterranean. London, 1904.

Feiling, K.: History of the Tory Party. Oxford, 1924.
Horne, T. H.: Life of William Beveridge. London, 1824.
Kettlewell, John: Life of, ed. by T. T. Carter. London, 1895.
Mahan, A. T.: The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660-1783. Boston, 1898.
Mant, (Bishop): History of the Irish Church. London, 1830.
Middlesex Quarter Sessions Records.
Paget, J.: The New Examen. Edinburgh, 1861.
Portus, G.: Caritas Anglicana. London, 1912.
Story, R. H.: Life of William Castares. London, 1874.
Stroughton, J.: History of Religion in England. London, 1901.

INDEX

Address of Loyalty, 98
Ailesbury, Earl of, 99 f., 184, 204
Annandale, Earl of, 60, 69-71, 74, 76
Anne, Princess of Denmark, 3, 34, 95, 163, 173, 187-93
Apsley, Miss, (Lady Bathurst) 9, 11, 16, 18-20, 26 f.
Arran, Lord, 70
Asaph, Bishop of, 44
Ashby, 123, 125 f.
Ashton, Richard, 79
Athol, Marquis of, 85
Athlone, 90 f.
Augsburg, League of, 27
Aughrim, 91

B., Monsieur de, 22
Beachy Head, Battle of, 63, 65
Bedford, Earl of, 181
Bentinck, Earl of Portland, 7, 19 f., 34, 50, 76, 93, 96, 99, 103
Beveridge, William, 144, 175
Blagrave, 157
Blair, James, 170
Blair, Sir Adam, 76
Blanchard, 85, 92
Blathwayt, 99
Bolton, Duke of, 74
Boyne, Battle of, 68, 76 f., 79, 143, 148
Breadalbane, Earl of, 70, 84 f., 88
Brest, 94, 101 f., 105, 114-16
Bradford, Earl of, 162
Buckley, Sir Richard, 179, 181
Burnet, Gilbert, Bishop of Salisbury, 15, 17, 23-25, 27 f., 34, 42, 44, 74, 78, 113, 127, 140 f., 143, 147, 149, 152-54, 156, 162 f., 169-71, 174 f., 194 f., 204

Cabinet Council, 49, 57, 94, 105, 123-25, 133-36, 138
Carstares, William, 51
Chambers, 149
Charles I, King of England, 201
Charles II, King of England, 3-8, 11, 13 f., 20, 183
Chelsea Hospital, 168
Chester, Bishop of, 174
Churchill, Captain, 97
Clarendon, first Earl of, 201
Clarendon, second Earl of, 56, 80
Claverhouse, 83
Colt, Sir William, 132 f.
Compton, Bishop of London, 3, 14, 20, 23 f., 27, 148, 168, 174 f.
Comprehension, Bill of, 38
Coningsby, 149
Convention, 33
Corporation Bill, 43
Covel, Dr., 20
Crawford, Lord, 43
Crone, 74, 80

D'Albeville, 23, 31
D'Alone, 60, 69
Danby, Earl of Carmarthen, 5, 7, 34, 38, 48-50, 57, 64, 68, 90, 120, 124, 127 f., 130, 183, 197
D'Avaux, 17-19, 22 f., 27
Declaration of Indulgence, 4, 23
Dartmouth, Earl of, 137 f.
Delavel, 101
Derby, Lord, 136
Devonshire, Duke of, 49, 57, 64, 74, 120 f., 125 f.
Dodwell, Henry, 146
Dorset, Earl of, 49, 81, 183
Dover, Treaty of, 4
Dundee, Viscount, 44
Dunlop, William, 51
Dunkirk, 66
Dykevelt, 28

Eliot, a Jacobite, 79
Elizabeth, Queen of England, 23, 54, 139
Ely, Bishop of, 73, 80, 144
Exclusion Bill, 11-14, 24

Ferguson, a Jacobite, 60 f.
Firmin, Thos., 155
Fleury, Battle of, 59
Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester, 160, 162 f., 171, 180
Foxcroft, Miss (quoted), 153, 163
Frampton, non-juring Bishop of Gloucester, 144, 146
France, 4, 6, 8, 20, 27, 44, 51, 79, 90, 92, 94 f., 104, 106, 108, 110, 131, 196
Fuller, 51, 74, 81

Galway, 91
Ginkel, 90, 92
Glencoe, 88
Godolphin, Lord, 73, 90, 95, 115 f., 127 f., 183
Grafton, Duke of, 150
Grand Alliance, 44, 114, 132
Green, Captain, 114 f.
Greenwich Hospital, 168 f.
Grerson, Thomas, 165
Grey, Lady Jane, 54

Haddick, Richard, 123, 125 f.
Hague, 5, 11 f., 18, 21, 23
Halifax, Marquis of, 13, 17, 33 f., 39, 40-42, 45, 95, 120, 139-42, 173, 197
Hamilton, Duke of, 43, 85-87
Harley, Robert, 178 f.
Hampton Court, 36, 41, 185
Harley, Sir Edward, 178 f.
Hartley, Mr., 179
Herbert, Lord Torrington, 32, 49, 52, 55-58, 61-65, 123
Hickes, Dr., 24, 143, 147
High Commission, 24
Hooper, Dr., Dean of Canterbury, 14, 139, 155, 164 f.
Horneck, Anthony, 154
Huyghens, 15
Hyde, Lawrence, 14
Hyde Park, 66, 70, 75

Indemnity, Bill of, 134
Ireland, 40, 44 f., 51, 53, 55, 59, 70, 78 f., 83, 89 f., 92, 94, 163, 168, 193, 196 f.

Jacobitism, 37, 39, 43, 51, 53, 56, 70, 75, 77, 79, 82, 84, 89, 94 f., 98, 106, 116, 120, 143, 197-99
James, Duke of York, and King of England, 3-5, 8, 11-14, 16-18, 20 f., 24, 28 f., 33, 37, 44, 59, 69-72, 75, 79, 83, 95, 115 f., 144-46, 148, 196-98, 200
Jessen, Madam, 145 f.
Johnstone, James, 76 f., 89
Jurieu, Peter, 202 f.

Ken, non-juring Bishop of Bath and Wells, 12, 14 f., 144-46, 199 f.
Kensington, 41, 82, 93, 108
Killigrew, 57, 61, 126
Kidder, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 144
King, Bishop of Dublin, 150 f.

Lagos Bay, 112
La Hogue, 97, 101, 104-06, 108-10, 116, 145, 168, 193, 198, 200
Lake, Dr. Edward, 3, 14
Landen, Battle of, 111
Lee, Sir Thomas, 123-26, 129
Leinster, Duke of, 85 f., 88, 99, 105, 107
Levingston, Sir Thomas, 85-87
Limerick, 89, 91
Limerick, Treaty of, 93
Lincoln, Lord, 133
Lloyd, a Jacobite, 115

Lockhart, Sir William, 59, 68-71
Louis XIV, King of France, 4, 13 f., 18, 21, 44, 59, 104 f., 109, 114 f., 196-98
Lowther, Sir John, 38, 49

Mackay, Major General, 83
Mant, 150 f.
Marlborough, Earl of, 49, 73, 95-97, 115 f., 128, 188 f., 192
Marlborough, Countess of, 187-92
Marsh, Dr., 147, 149 f.
Mary of Modena, 3, 51, 79
McMillian, J., 165 f.
Mediterranean, 108 f., 111 f., 114, 117
Melvill, Lord, 43, 56, 59, 68, 70-72, 87 f., 165 f.
Monmouth, Duke of, 12, 20 f.
Monmouth, Earl of, 40, 49, 58, 72-74, 116, 120 f., 129, 183
Montague, Lord, 74
Montgomery, Sir James, 60, 69-72, 74, 116, 193

Namur, 103, 105
Nantes, Edict of, 21, 171
Nimeguen, Treaty of, 8
Norfolk, Duke of, 178
Normanby, 135
Nottingham, Earl of, 38, 41, 49, 52, 54 f., 57 f., 77, 86, 97, 99, 101 f., 109, 120, 122, 124-28, 130 f., 133 f., 136-38, 144, 148 f., 167-69, 181, 183, 190, 194, 203
Nottingham, Anne, Countess of, 204

Oglethorp, 60, 75
Ormonde, Duchess of, 186 f.
Ossory, 5
Oxford Parliament, 14

Patrick, Bishop of Chichester, 141, 152
Payne, Nevil, 70
Pelham, 139
Pembroke, Lord, 49, 52, 64, 123-25, 183
Penn, William, 23, 80
Place Bill, 128
Preston, Lord, 31, 79 f., 85, 137, 144
Priestman, Captain, 124
Privy Council, 45, 49, 53, 56, 64, 66, 68, 97, 112, 120 f., 127 f., 133-35, 166, 168 f., 171, 176
Privy Purse Accounts, 160, 164, 172
Protestant Refugees, 22, 36, 171-73

Ranelagh, 127, 162
Reformation of Manners and Morals, 174
Regency Bill, 47 f., 194
Restoration, 24
Revolution of 1688, 28, 52, 65
Robartes, Sir G., 167
Rochester, Lord, 42, 127 f., 143, 189
Ronquillo, 130 f.
Rooke, Sir G., 110, 112
Ross, Lord, 51, 56, 59-62, 67-70, 74, 96
Rowe, Sir Thomas, 166
Russell, Admiral, 49, 52, 61 f., 95, 97 f., 100-02, 104-10, 115-17, 120, 122-25, 133, 138, 155
Russell, Lady Rachel, 82, 108, 122, 152, 181, 185 f.
Rye House Plot, 20, 24

Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, 29, 143 f., 148, 151
Scarborough, Lady, 162, 186
Scarsdale, Lord, 100
Scotland, 40, 42 f., 51, 59, 66-69, 72-74, 79, 83, 85, 87, 94, 197
Seven Bishops, Aquittal of, 30
Seymour, 127, 133
Sharp, Archbishop of York, 151, 158
Sherlock, 155
Shovell, Sir Cloudesley, 57

Shrewsbury, Earl of, 30, 48, 80, 114-17, 122, 124, 128, 133, 138
Sidney, Henry, 11 f., 80, 127, 131, 149, 183
Skelton, 11
Somers, Sir J., 181
Sophia of Hanover, 40, 111, 113, 132
South, 155
Stanley, Dr., 23, 27-29
St. Bartholomew's Fair, 178
Steinkirke, 105, 186
Stephens, Edward, 176
Stewart of Appin, 86
Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester, 142, 176
St. Malo, 66, 94, 101, 106 f.
Strickland, Miss A., quoted, 17 f.
Sylvius, Sir Gabriel, 12, 15
Synge, 149 f.

Talmash, Lieutenant-General, 114
Tangiers, 118
Tarbet, Viscount, 84
Temple, Sir William, 5, 7 f.
Tenison, Bishop of Lincoln, 151
Test Act, 5, 38 f., 141
Tilley, Roger, 75
Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury, 142, 144, 151-56, 162, 175, 194 f., 204
Titus Oates, 11
Toleration, Bill of, 38, 142, 154
Torrington, Lord. *See* Herbert
Trench, 149
Trenchard, 110-12
Trevor, Sir John, 143
Triennial Bill, 128 f.
Triple Alliance, 4
Trumbull, Sir W., 113, 172
Tyrconnel, 90

Vane, Sir Walter, 5
Vauban, 115
Villiers, Elizabeth, 16, 22, 194, 199
Virginia, 170

Wales, Prince of, 30 f.
Wharton, Philip, Lord, 175, 185
Wharton, Goodwin, 122 f., 134, 163, 187 f.
Wharton, Thomas, 123 f., 183
William and Mary College, Virginia, 170
Williamson, 70
Windsor, 186
Woburn, 185
Worth, Mary, 15

Yates, Mr., 179, 181

Zulestein, 15